THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR

Vol. 7 Spring · 1938 No. 2

On the Importance of being Unprincipled — *John Herman Randall, Jr.*

The Gentle Art of Getting On — *John Hodgdon Bradley*

Robert Owen: Backwater of History? — *Kenneth M. Gould*

Goliath . . . Now David — *Ernest H. Wilkins*

Archeology Confronts Biblical Cricitism — *W. F. Albright*

Dr. Rhine and the Mind's Eye — *Gardner Murphy*

Is It Chance or ESP? — *Edward V. Huntington*

The Storm Center in Treaty-Making — *Harold H. Sprout*

Spiritual Dualism and Daily Bread — *Nicholas Berdyaev*

Surrealism—Or The Reason for Unreason — *Jean Charlot*

Published Quarterly for General Circulation by

P H I · B E T A · K A P P A

$2.00 a year 50 cents a copy

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHITHER PROTESTANTISM?

How will the Barthian school affect American and European thought? What will be the implications of recent archeological finds for "higher criticism" and the Wellhausen school?

Walter M. Horton's article on THE NEW ORTHODOXY in the Winter American Scholar, and W. F. Albright's essay in this issue discuss the current trends of Protestantism from those two points of view. And because the editorial board of

THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR

believes there is a wide-spread interest in this subject, it plans to follow these articles with the following, to appear in forthcoming issues:

HIGHER CRITICISM SURVIVES ARCHEOLOGY
William C. Graham

MUST RELIGION BE UNREASONABLE? Julius Seelye Bixler

UNREPENTANT LIBERALISM Shailer Mathews

THE DILEMMA OF THE PRESENT-DAY MORALIST
Harold Chapman

PROTESTANTISM—CAREENING OR BALANCED?
Joseph Haroutunian

Forthcoming issues will also, of course, contain the usual wide variety of essays in other fields of thought and scholarship.

THE EDITORIAL BOARD

John Bakeless	Will David Howe	William Allan Neilson
Harry Woodburn Chase	Burton E. Livingston	J. Herman Randall, Jr.
John Erskine	Archibald MacLeish	Mary K. Simkhovitch
Christian Gauss	Dumas Malone	Irita Van Doren

William Allison Shimer, *Editor*

Ruth E. Campbell, *Assistant Editor*

Frank Pierrepont Graves, *Consulting Editor*

THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR is published four times a year, December, March, May and September by the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa. The annual subscription is $2 (Canada, $2.25; foreign, $2.50). Publication office, Federal and Nineteenth Streets, Camden, New Jersey. Editorial office, 145 West 55 Street, New York, N. Y. Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Camden, New Jersey, under the act of March 3, 1879. Printed in the United States of America. Copyright 1938, by the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa. Volume 7, No. 2.

Note—Authors who wish manuscripts returned in case publication is not feasible should attach sufficient postage.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SPRING · 1938 VOLUME 7 · No. 2

THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR

PHI · BETA · KAPPA

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The American Scholar

Spring • 1938 Vol. 7 • No. 2

Contents

On the Importance of Being Unprincipled — John Herman Randall, Jr. — 131

The Gentle Art of Getting On (A Study of Parasites) — John Hodgdon Bradley — 144

Robert Owen: Backwater of History? — Kenneth M. Gould — 153

Goliath . . . Now David — Ernest H. Wilkins — 171

Archeology Confronts Biblical Criticism — W. F. Albright — 176

Dr. Rhine and the Mind's Eye — Gardner Murphy — 189

Is It Chance or ESP? — Edward V. Huntington — 201

The Storm Center in Treaty-Making — Harold H. Sprout — 211

Spiritual Dualism and Daily Bread — Nicholas Berdyaev — 223

Surrealism—Or The Reason for Unreason — Jean Charlot — 230

Illustration

Detail from "Illuminated Pleasures," Salvator Dali — Frontispiece

In the Workshop

Food and Society — Almon R. Wright — 243

Royal Road to Learning Chinese — 246

The Division of Music, the Library of Congress — Cedric Larson — 247

Discussion

The Conference Cure for Ignorance of Hispanic America — Henry Grattan Doyle — 249

About Our Authors

Compiled by Ruth E. Campbell — 252

Indexed in the *Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Courtesy of the Sidney Janis Collection and The Brooklyn Museum

A Detail from Salvator Dali's

"ILLUMINATED PLEASURES"

Size of original detail: 3¼ x 3⅛ inches

See "Surrealism—Or the Reason for Unreason," by Jean Charlot, page 230

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the Importance of Being Unprincipled

JOHN HERMAN RANDALL, JR.

SURELY there are more political principles in active circulation today than for many a long year. One has only to open the morning paper to be caught in a barrage of them. They volley from the Right, they thunder from the Left; and even peaceable citizens, anxious to go about their business undisturbed in the broad Center, have had to lay in a generous stock in self-defense. When we look across the seas we find the atmosphere from Moscow to Madrid so cluttered up with eternal principles in irrepressible conflict that it is hard to discern any merely human beings. Even the British Lion is going through contortions in the endeavor to put on the unaccustomed armor of principle. We are all in a fighting mood today. Mere name-calling, though satisfying for a time, soon exhausts our stock of epithets; and then, grasping a principle firmly in either hand, we sally forth bravely to the fray.

Side by side with this strife of principles has gone a marked decline in what we used to regard as political intelligence. At least the political intelligence that was once enough to adjust our differences seems no longer adequate now that we disagree so much more violently and, we are sure, so much more fundamentally. Indeed we have thought up elaborate if not wholly respectable philosophies to convince ourselves that the intelligence we are certain the other fellow doesn't possess has really no place in our political quarrels and that we have got to fight it out with him, the sooner the better. In the old days when one group of us disagreed with another about what ought to be done we managed in the end to effect some kind of working

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

compromise with them. Today it has come to be the fashion, in Europe at least, to shoot them instead. Why waste time trying to argue? Direct action is so much simpler and more expeditious! America has so far proved a notable exception to this new fashion. Under a consummate compromiser, a leader quite gratifyingly unprincipled, it seems to be displaying more political intelligence than any other major country. And wonder of wonders, that intelligence has made its appearance even in the steel industry!

Now there seems to be a very close connection between this decline in political intelligence and the rise of the appeal to principles. In fact most of the world's political difficulties today focus in men's preference for laying down principles and fighting over them rather than engaging in the give and take of discussion and eventual compromise. So it seems worth while to emphasize the importance of being unprincipled in political action. In political action, mind you—for in themselves principles are fine things. In their proper place of course they are quite indispensable. But that place is not to regulate the group activities of men. Men can live together and succeed in accomplishing things cooperatively only if they have the patience and the intelligence to compromise. It would of course sound less unconventional if instead of speaking of unprincipled action I spoke of "the principle of compromise," meaning thereby the principle of acting without regard to one's principles in the interest of acting with other men. And should some dialectician object that I too am advocating a single principle of compromise against all others I could not demur. For what is at issue, against all the new political faiths and certainties flying about in our world, is very close to what I conceive to be the American way. It is commonly known, in fact, by a more familiar name. It is not the name but the political method I am concerned with; I want to make clear what is really involved in what Americans conceive political intelligence to be.

Now anybody who is at all capable of learning anything from experience knows that the only way to get along with

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people, the only way to do anything together with anybody else, is through compromise. You don't need exceptional brains to realize that; you need only to be married or to have a friend. Cooperation between human beings is possible only if they are willing to compromise; and politics, the art of cooperation, of group action, is at bottom nothing but the practical application of the method of compromise. Only two kinds of men can really afford the luxury of acting always on principle: those who never act at all, who live in a sort of social vacuum, who never try to get other men to do anything; and those who have so much power they don't have to regard the wishes or habits of other men but can just give commands. These are the two kinds of men who know nothing about the art of cooperation, the impotent and the omnipotent—the college professor and the Supreme Court Justice, for example.

But of course no one ever really does act on principle alone, with complete logical consistency. For no man is so omnipotent, not even a Dictator, that he does not have to resort to all kinds of compromises with his followers to secure the power to shoot those who disagree with him. And no man is so impotent that he never tries to cooperate with his fellows at all. Should he begin to act that way we have a special institution made for him in which we lock him up—the insane asylum. Even college professors, who often have the brains to think up all kinds of principles and the irresponsibility to advocate them, are likely to forget all about them, blithely and intelligently, when it comes to college affairs where they have some power and some responsibility for action. They become good college politicians. And should they rise to be "administrators," deans and presidents, they are notoriously likely to become the most unprincipled of men. To be sure they are apt to retain the bad habit of talking about principles. This is a little unfortunate, for it makes them seem hypocrites. It is really only an occupational disease, shared by most intelligent administrators who happen also to be intellectuals.

In general it is only intellectuals, those who think but don't

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have to act, who may understand things clearly but never really try to do anything about it, that can afford to have political principles. It is preachers, teachers, writers and literary men who can get down to the roots of things and really understand them. They are free to be political radicals. The only action such men ever have to engage in is to protest, in the name of their principles, at what other men are doing. Principles are great things for protesting. That is in fact about the only kind of action you can really accomplish with them. Such intellectuals are never faced by the problem of getting something done, of cooperating with other men. It is significant that radical intellectuals, those who have the firmest and often the most penetrating principles, are notoriously incapable of cooperating with each other; and that groups which begin by protesting against things in general are apt to end in bitter protest against each other's principles. That is at bottom why practical men, trade unionists for example, are so suspicious of intellectuals; they have too many principles which seem quite irrelevant to the problems faced in daily living. They are so unable to compromise—they have never been forced by experience to learn how! They have so little political intelligence.

A friend recently returned to university teaching from Washington where he had been engaged in several of the many enterprises there going on. "Now that you're back again," a colleague remarked, "you can afford to be radical once more. You have no further responsibility for getting anything done." "Yes," the ex-scholar in politics replied, "now I can get back to criticizing. Why, there in Washington I was too busy trying to set up and get those important agencies going ever to ask whether what I was doing was really consistent with my principles."

The reason why principles are irrelevant to any political or cooperative action lies in the very nature of principles. Principles, as defined by Aristotle, who discovered them, are those ideas in terms of which something is understood. They are the set of concepts and axioms which make it intelligible to us.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When once we see them then everything else falls into a consistent pattern; it all makes sense we say. Just what ideas will make a thing intelligible to us, Aristotle pointed out, depends on our experience; and we have found out since Aristotle that the same things can be understood in a great variety of ways, depending on what our experience of them has been—that is, that a single thing can be made intelligible in terms of a number of differing sets of principles, as our experience of it has varied.

Principles are accordingly instruments not of action but of understanding. Their place is not in the practical art of politics but in the knowledge that is science. The history of our science has been the history of the change and modification of the principles that enabled men to understand as their experience has been changed and enlarged. Now science or organized understanding has built up a kind of cooperative experience shared by all scientists. Therefore there is a fair measure of agreement, at any one time, on the principles in terms of which the subject-matter of any one science is to be understood, though notoriously it is these principles of explanation—the way in which the observed facts are to be understood—that form just that aspect of science about which there is most difference of opinion. There is in fact no science in which there are not various "schools," so far as "theory" goes, various principles entertained; though on the experimental findings there is substantial agreement.

But what is a minor factor in science is the prevailing rule with practical problems. There are no two men who understand a given situation in precisely the same terms, for there are no two men whose previous experience has been precisely the same. Anyone who has ever served on a committee knows that if there are 15 members, 15 really informed men, 15 experts, there will be 15 different slants on the committee's problem, 15 different sets of principles through which it is approached. Especially is it true that there are no two economic groups, whose adjustment and cooperation furnish the major task of present-day politics, which see problems in the same

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

light or which have had the same experience. How could one expect Kansas farmers, Detroit auto-workers, Lawrence mill-hands and New York bankers to understand anything in the same terms? Each group has found for itself different principles; and even should they all agree that they want the same thing—security for example—it would inevitably mean something different for each group.

In such political problems there is no possibility, that could be more than verbal, of agreement on principles, no possibility of really understanding the problem in the same way. You can never hope to get two groups, two parties to a controversy, to see it in the same light, to have it make sense in the same way, for such parties never look out on the world through the windows of the same experience. What you can hope to get agreement on is some specific measure, some concrete program of action. That program will not completely satisfy anybody or any group and each will understand it and criticize its shortcomings in the light of their own principles. But if it is a successful compromise it will give all of them enough of what they want to make them support it.

The way it actually works is familiar enough. A group, let us say a committee, meets to tackle a problem. Each member begins by laying down his principles, how it shapes up for him, his slant upon it. This takes a lot of talking. Then, if the members are good politicians and possess political intelligence, they stop talking about principles and get down to the real business of working out a compromise measure which will meet the major objections and do something to satisfy the most insistent demands. The result is finally laid before the groups concerned, who, not having been present at the previous discussion, repeat the same objections that were there dealt with. There is a new outburst of principles and criticism. If this keeps up too long the plan is modified to satisfy the loudest protests and then put into effect. In its actual operation it will have certain consequences that no one foresaw and there will be more roars. Something then has to be done to appease them;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and so it goes on. This is the political method, the method of compromise at work. It is obviously a never-ending process. It is the only way of getting men to work together, the only way of really enlisting their cooperative interest and effort, no matter what principles they may severally have or think they have. We call this method "democratic" according to how early in the process the different groups concerned have a chance to talk, to make their wants known and to object. Under any scheme of organizing human action they will do so in the end, and if they are strong enough they will make their demands felt and have to be given something.

If the members of our committee are not good politicians, if they are intellectuals without much intelligence, they will naturally keep on talking about principles a lot longer. Each will try to convert the others to his own. That will probably result in a deadlock and nothing will be accomplished. If something simply has to be done there are two chief ways out. Either the talk will go on until everyone manages to understand each other's principles and there is general agreement that each is right from his own point of view. The committee will then be able to compromise on a practical plan. Or else somebody will propose a new principle, more general than those previously argued for—so general, in fact, that each can accept it with his own private interpretation. Then they will get down to business. In either case the committee will never begin to get anywhere till the principles have been removed from discussion by some means or other. The easiest way of dealing with such principled men is to agree immediately to all their principles. It is in fact the only way of getting a man with no political sense whatever to compromise. Usually, after everybody has grown tired of talking about principles—or rather after everybody has grown tired of hearing the others talk about theirs, for no man ever wearies of expounding his own—and it is clear that the discussion is getting nowhere somebody will remark, "Now that we are all agreed in principle"—and then the real compromising begins.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is the method of politics. Of course if you don't really want to get men to do anything, if you don't have to solve the problem, you can stick to your principles and refuse all traffic with compromise. This will normally be either because you don't want to act at all, because you are irresponsible and don't have to, and prefer to be free to criticize; or else because you want to fight. Now principles are perfectly grand for fighting. You can't really fight well without them; at least you can't fight very long without acquiring a set. For a principle is by definition a postulate, an assumption: it is an idea that cannot be proved by anything else or it would not be a principle. Nor can it be verified by an experience different from your own. Since you can't therefore prove it if it is questioned you can only support it by fighting for it. To call a thing a principle means that the case is closed and the argument over. You are going to act, no matter what the consequences; you are going to fight to the bitter end. It has become "a matter of principle" with you. Those words are uttered when faith burns bright and you are resolved to turn from words to deeds. And when you have made such a resolve of course you have to formulate principles to justify your intransigeance.

In practical matters no particular problem is ever solved by an appeal to principles. To make such an appeal leads to a fight and is intended to lead to a fight. When the fight is over and the principle "established," or when both parties have finally got tired of fighting for their principles, the problem still remains to be solved, and to be solved by the political method of compromise and adjustment of conflicting interests and demands, in an atmosphere now made doubly difficult by the fighting psychology and the passionate devotion to principles that have been generated. The really big fights, like revolutions, usually give rise to a situation in which political intelligence, the ability to compromise, is quite destroyed. And the successful revolutionists normally start fighting among themselves over their principles until they are kicked aside by some politically-minded man who knows how to get men to com-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

promise and work together on their problems. The most famous man of resolute principle in the world today is Leon Trotsky.

Of course there is often nothing to do but fight if political intelligence be so lacking that some entrenched group refuses to admit this political method, refuses to meet and discuss and bargain and compromise. Industrial corporations have been known to act thus unpolitically toward their employees. Then the political method becomes itself a principle that has to be fought for. In fact the only thing that fighting does seem to be able to win is the adoption of a certain method, and it can achieve permanent gains only if that method be the method of politics. Experience reveals that the only principle really worth fighting for is the extension of the principle of compromise to a new area in which it has not prevailed before—to the field of industrial relations, for example, or to those problems where the Supreme Court says political compromise mustn't be applied. It is significant that our politician president has seemed willing to compromise on anything and everything except the refusal to allow compromise or to permit the political method to be employed. He seems willing to fight to enable political intelligence to function.

It is the politician who is the expert in the method of compromise. He possesses the art of getting conflicting groups and interests together in some working balance of effective forces. He helps them think out some plan to which none will object too violently. Inevitably the measures that result from his efforts are likely to be inconsistent when judged by any principle. They are always faulty, in the sense that they never do everything that any group wants; they never do all that any clear principle would demand they should. They stand always in need of amending and re-amending. They are a register of the effective demands of those concerned, worked out by pressure groups pressing and lobbyists lobbying and a final slow process of compromise. Men with principles, especially if they are irresponsible and don't have to take part in the complex process,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are always prone to exclaim: How much better if we had real leaders with clear principles, able to force through what is so obviously desirable! If some groups don't want what I see is needed they should be made to take it and like it.

Other nations today have found such Leaders. They have swept away the politicians and substituted coercion for compromise. To be sure, even such leaders have to be politically minded and have to compromise with any really insistent demand. But most Americans would agree that there is a genuine difference. These Leaders are pretty ruthless about coercing minority groups, or larger groups that are weak and get the worst of the official adjustment of conflicting interests. Politicians and the method of politics have their virtues in comparison with Dictators and Storm Troops and the Gestapo. Perhaps the most important function of politicians is to act as a buffer in our group conflicts. They soften bitter passions and moderate the storms that without them might so easily lead to the violent coercion of weaker groups. Politicians may on occasion be less than wholly honest and veracious but they don't shoot us—and what is still more important, they keep us from shooting each other. They give us enough of what we demand to keep our principles slightly below the boiling point. With politicians in charge the way, we know, is always open to compromise. The danger begins when anything is definitely removed from politics and made a matter of principle, for then the shooting is likely to begin.

Politicians can perform their function of effecting compromises and softening clashes only if they have no principles of their own. Their most engaging quality, in fact, is that they are so largely unprincipled themselves and can therefore get down to business so easily. At least they keep their principles for their speeches and rarely let them interfere with their work. And the whole political process can go on only if men are willing to grant that every group knows its own problems and its own needs better than anyone else and is therefore entitled to get as much of what it wants as it can. Once get the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

idea that you know better than other men what is really good for them, once get faith in some principle which will tell you just what the nation must do to be saved and just what every man ought to be working for, and you will have little stomach for the political method. What you see clearly as the one thing needful will seem so important that you will have no patience with those who see incorrectly. If you have the virus of political principles you will always be losing your patience with the fools or the rascals who see something else. Impatience is the characteristic mark of the over-principled. They cannot wait to persuade or educate—or learn. They have to act right away, on principle. They have to get other people to act; they have to force them to act. Any means and any method will be justified by your principle: that is where single-minded devotion to political principle always ends up. Such a man will naturally hate the very thought of compromise; he will much prefer to shoot or even to get shot. Europe is full of just such men of principle today; and with so many principles and such intense faith in them it will be very lucky to get off without fanatical religious wars on a grand scale. It has very little political intelligence left: it has lost the ability to compromise.

In America we have not reached such a desperate state as yet. We do not take up arms after an election because our side has lost or won. It seems that not even the Liberty League believed in its principles. The nearest approach to such intensity of faith is probably to be found in some of our Communist friends. But I have never known a Communist in this country who seemed really capable of shooting; and if they persist in their present policy of a united front (that is of politic compromise in action) they are bound sooner or later to lose their principles—though it is too much to expect that they will ever stop talking about them.

What we Americans are prone to call our "principles"—such things as freedom, security, equality, democracy and the like—are really not so much ideals to be debated and fought over as problems to be worked out by political methods in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

particular instances. Absolute freedom and absolute security are not given to mortal man. Human freedom and human security are specific problems to be dealt with in specific cases. They can be solved only if they are made questions of fact, of inquiry about the means of securing them, of getting compromises not too unsatisfactory to those concerned. They can be solved only if the conditions are established that will transform conflict and debate into inquiry into a problem: only, that is, if the political method of compromise is enabled to function. Any solution of our social and industrial difficulties will therefore depend on our becoming as a people more politically minded, on our developing more political intelligence. We need more actual experience in compromising on measures for dealing with particular problems under particular conditions; we must become less rather than more content to take refuge in general principles, to sit back, criticize, protest and fight.

There is great hope for the spread of such political-mindedness in the countless boards and committees of the agencies set up by the present administration. The A.A.A. was peculiarly successful in this political education but even the N.R.A. played its part and the training it gave seems to have had a good deal to do with the political intelligence recently displayed by both the C.I.O. and employers. The spread of labor organization, especially along industrial lines, in which countless locals and boards really face the problems of their industry as a whole, cannot but be a factor in generating further political intelligence. Only with such political-mindedness can America hope to escape the devastating effects of the essentially unpolitical class-struggle that has afflicted Europe. That is the very antithesis of the method of politics, the method of compromise and political intelligence: it is the method of fighting for principles and of ruthless coercion for the vanquished. And lest some troubled soul rise at this point to ask whether America really can escape the fate of Spain or Germany let me anticipate his query by insisting that I do not know and that I know that he does not know, nor does any one else. But I do know that to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

act on the principle that America cannot escape is the surest way to destroy political intelligence. There will doubtless be many particular fights to establish the conditions of political compromise; there will be a general fight only if both sides abandon politics for principles.

What I have been calling "political intelligence" and "the method of compromise" is usually called "democracy." I have preferred not to use that term, for democracy is usually taken as an ideal, a goal, a principle—that is, as something quite meaningless and irrelevant to political problems. I have been considering what is implied in democracy taken concretely as a method, a method of dealing with particular problems by the active participation of as many as possible of those concerned and there hammering out a working solution to be revised in the light of further experience. The democratic method does not consist in sending men to Washington with a majority to install some scheme which will usher in the millennium. That is not the democratic method at all; that is the method of Hitler, all except the millennium.

In our struggling world the problems are largely set for us—set by what different groups of men want and by the opportunities and the limitations of the natural and technical materials we have to work with. We possess the technical skill to give men what they want in abundance. We already possess a surprising amount of economic intelligence: we know how to go far in relieving our economic insecurity. The great problem is how to get men to apply this skill and intelligence, how to get them to agree to use the intelligence now available in our society. Our pressing need is for political intelligence. The means which Americans have the chance to employ is the method of democracy—the method of politics, of compromise on particular measures, in disregard of our principles, however dear.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Gentle Art of Getting On

A Study of Parasites

JOHN HODGDON BRADLEY

PEACE is a beautiful concept of the human mind. It is as unique as it is beautiful. There is no evidence that as a concept it has ever occurred to any other than a human mind, or that as a practice it has ever been significantly involved in terrestrial affairs. For two billion years those affairs have proceeded through conflict. Rivers, wind and moving ice have worked to tear down the lands; volcanoes and subterranean upheavals have worked to build them up. Never have the titanic conflicts of these forces been much or for long disturbed by peace. The earth as we know it, indeed, would cease to exist if peace as we imagine it should ever truly come.

So too with the creatures that live on the earth. Conflict is inherent in their nature. Ever since Malthus and Darwin shook the thinking world with their demonstration of an earth too small and lean to rear all the seed of its loins the clash of living has been generally assumed to be chiefly the result of overpopulation. Doubtless a great misfortune of mice and men is that there are too many of them—but even in a less populous world, living would yet be a hazardous business. Most associations of creatures are bound to be felonious because Nature made living synonymous with eating. Were there but half as many plants and animals in the world the proportion of robbery and murder would unfortunately be much the same as it is today. Indeed if there were but one lichen, one reindeer, one wolf and one worm to share all the beauty and bounty of the earth they would yet be largely devoted to devouring one another. The nutritive chain that binds all living things together and makes

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all living possible binds all society also to a level somewhat lower than Utopia. "Force and fraud," said Thomas Hobbes, "are in war the cardinal virtues." Biologic science, three hundred years later, discards Hobbes' phrasing but retains his thought. Force and fraud are certainly the cardinal aspects of the battle of living whether or not they are dressed in the quaint terminology of human ethics. Remove the "force" of predacity and the "fraud" of parasitism from the spectacle and the spectacle disappears.

The struggles of species to maintain themselves are similar in aim and tactics to the struggles between nations of men. In most cases the members of the same species fight, like men, more desperately with one another than with creatures of different blood. Because they live in the same environment and require the same kind of food and protection their greatest battles are among themselves. Cannibalism has always been a popular career. On the washes of the Colorado Desert the creosote bushes are spaced at remarkably regular intervals, each bush commanding all the sparse bounty of a definite area. For each bush that gains the means of survival in this dour land many less fortunate ones must die. Similarly in the lusher woodlands of the North countless seedlings are born that can never mature. With time the weaker are robbed of moisture, light and air by the stronger of their own kind. To make a forest many are called but few are chosen.

For every example of mutual help among the gregarious and social animals there are many examples of conflict. The fisherman knows that a pike will rise to a baby pike as readily as to a shiner. The lobster culturist knows that lobsters prefer lobster to any other food. The paleontologist knows that the wounds in the skulls of the great horned dinosaurs were made by the horns of other horned dinosaurs. Everywhere and always brothers have clutched at each other's throat.

But strangers also quarrel. The cephalopods and the fishes have been enemies since the Silurian period. The dramatic en-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gagements of white and red ants are classic. Because Nature arranged that life may exist only through death, propinquity determines the warriors and convenience the battle technique.

At first thought it would seem that the beasts of prey have the greatest advantage in the struggle for survival. Such, however, is not the case. A mountain lion in Montana may kill as many as 50 deer in a winter; yet only where men have interfered are lions notably increasing or deer decreasing. Nature has so balanced the fertility of the deer against the ferocity of the lions that both species may continue to exist. An owl in exercising the prerogatives of owlhood destroys several smaller birds which in their turn eat thousands of spiders, worms and insects which consume untold millions of other creatures lesser than themselves. In such chains of varying length do the larger, stronger and fewer live at the expense of the smaller, weaker and more abundant. Yet in a well-adjusted society each species is able to endure. Each pays the price of existence with the surplus of individuals which Nature has provided for that purpose but retains a modest balance in the bank with which to carry on.

Though life is inescapably the clash of steel on steel, the endless attrition which endless nutrition demands, organic associations are not invariably lethal. Nature has provided that many relationships shall be mutually beneficial or at worst no threat to the welfare of the parties involved. Those who seek examples of Christian morality in the animal kingdom have made a parable of the pilot fish and the shark. To pay for the crumbs which he filches from the latter's feeding, the former is supposed to lead the way to each new meal. Unhappily for the sentiment of the parable many a shark does very well without this alleged service. Indeed just to look at a shark is to convince oneself that here if anywhere is a creature adequate to its calling. A better example of a mutually beneficial association is the rhinoceros and the birds that dig the ticks from his hide. The rhinoceros gains not only relief from his torment but also

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a more reliable warning of danger from his fluttery companions than he could obtain through his own unaided wits. The birds in their turn get only the ticks but they seem content. So, too, would seem to be the plover which, according to Herodotus, removes leeches from the back of the crocodile and even obligingly picks his teeth. Perhaps the best instance of a beneficent external partnership is that of the hermit crab and the hydroid. By covering the crab with its fuzzy tentaculated body the hydroid contributes a disguise as well as a battery of stinging cells when the disguise fails. In return it gains free transportation and scraps from the crustacean's table.

The most intimate beneficent partnerships in Nature are internal rather than external and so close in some cases that death alone may sunder them. Certain one-celled plants are known to live in such a union with certain one-celled animals. The plant uses the carbon dioxide and the nitrogenous waste produced in the body of the animal and the animal uses the oxygen and starch produced in the body of the plant. Somewhat similar is the association of a green alga and a colorless fungus in a lichen. Thus by a strange perversity creatures with antagonistic feeding habits become mutually beneficial.

A great many organic associations are helpful to one of the members only and yet not harmful to the other. A lichen clinging to the bark of a tree takes less from the tree than does the bird that flits among its branches, for the bird may filch both board and lodging whereas the lichen is content with lodging alone. Most of the primitive plants and animals that infest the mouth and intestines of man live amicably enough with their overgrown ally. They pasture on his warm and fertile innards as cows on grass. Many of them are spongers who make no return for favors received but neither do they do any harm. Similarly the little fish who dwells with no observable embarrassment in the rectum of a sea cucumber is a squatter but not a rascal. Nature, noted neither for justice or fastidiousness, has vouchsafed in this instance certain concessions to propriety by shifting the vent of the fish to a spot beneath the throat, so

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that when the creature rests with its head projecting over the threshold of its strange home it may void waste without befouling its partner.

Relationships such as these are benign enough but they are only a step from felony. The strongest impulse in the living world is the urge to live as easily as possible. Partnership is only a convenience to that end. When convenience is better served by one partner's taking an unfair advantage of the other he takes it. And unless he belongs to a single genus of large-brained, thin-haired primates he does so with neither qualm or rationalization.

Because everything in Nature merges with something else it is not easy to place strict limits upon the definition of anything. Most biologists are agreed that parasitism is a one-sided nutritional relationship between two organisms which leads to the injury of one and the degeneracy of the other. Some authorities would restrict parasitism to those partnerships wherein one partner has escaped the need of any strenuous struggle to maintain himself. But even when thus restricted, the ranks of parasitism are, alas, full. Half of all the animals alive today are enrolled.

As long ago as the Silurian period the tube-dwelling worms began to show an attachment for corals which they have never since abandoned. The worms availed themselves of the stability of the coral colonies to entrench themselves in places where food was plentiful. Amicably in youth the two settled down together, the coral engulfing the worm with the growth of its stony skeleton but leaving an opening through which the worm might come and go. The worm in return did not interfere with the coral in its own special pursuit of happiness. Such a relationship, however, is an invitation to disaster, corals and worms being what they are. The coral may engulf the worm to the point of imprisonment and death by suffocation and the worm may riddle the coral until it dies. There is evidence that both these abuses had occurred before the Devonian period was far

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

under way. Apparently, since their descendants are still in the sea, the more active worms in the end got the better of the bargain. Many of the corals, on the other hand, disappeared before the close of the period, victims presumably of old age but not of old age alone.

Such shelter and feeding associations have doubtless been incubators of parasitism but the habit might also have arisen in other ways. An insect, for example, whose ancestors had laid their eggs in the putrefying flesh of dead animals might abandon tradition and lay its eggs in a wound on a live one, its status therewith shifting from saprophyte to parasite. Similarly many animals are born with a distaste for light and must find like the mole their place in the dark. If that place happens to be the inside of a neighbor parasitism might result. Or a female in search of a sheltered spot to lay her eggs might choose the flesh of another creature. Under all these diversities, however, one constant persists: the urge to live as easily as possible.

The fly that laps up the sweat of a horse is perhaps more a scavenger than a parasite. The flea that wanders over the belly of a dog, refreshing itself with an occasional nip of blood, is perhaps more a predator than a parasite. But many insects that hypodermatically inject their eggs into the flesh of their neighbors are true parasites even though their young leave the host when their larval life is over. During their occupancy they steal enough of their victim's fat, with sufficiently little hardship or danger to themselves, to justify the appellation. Such parasites, however, are among the more respectable of their kind because they periodically abandon their victims.

Others, though perennial afflictions upon their hosts, have the grace to maraud with some restraint. In this group is the mistletoe, which takes water and salt from the trees it infests but uses its own green leaves to manufacture organic food.

Villains of different stripe are the trichina worms which encyst themselves in the muscles of their victims and may pass from host to host and from generation to generation without

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seeing the light of day for years on end. When their host is eaten by another animal the stomach juices of the latter dissolve the cysts and liberate hordes of worms which pair and bring forth myriads more. One infected pork sandwich can fill a man with as many worms and worries as there are people and problems in the United States. Compared with Trichina a parasite as gentle and abstemious as the mistletoe is only a superfluous decoration. But Trichina is not the only worm that devotes itself to its comrades while they are yet alive. Perhaps the most perfectly adjusted of all parasites is the tapeworm. He has lost his power of locomotion, his sense organs and his honor; but he has gained a marvelous aptitude for clinging to intestines without being dissolved by their juices and a prodigious ability in eating and spawning. The species that inhabit man are so rigidly specialized they cannot be persuaded to reside in any other creature. But not all parasites are as partial to a given host. The tubercle bacilli, for example, are unhappily quite adaptable.

In some cases parasitism achieves the complexity of a Chinese puzzle. A certain species of caterpillar devotes its life to despoiling the trees of New England. Twenty-three other varieties of insects reside either in or on the caterpillar and despoil him while he labors. These support thirteen parasites of their own which in turn harbor two, possibly five, more. One of the last may in some cases be parasitic on another in its own category, thus adding a fourth link to the fantastic chain.

To discover the ultimate possibility in parasitic debasement one must study the crabs. These animals are fated to endure not only the trials which are the universal penalty for mortality but also certain other afflictions designed for their special bedevilment. Many a crab develops in its abdomen a condition suggestive of a tumor, which arrests its growth and impairs its power of procreation. Dissection of the tumor reveals a mass of fibers which ramify like the roots of a plant to every corner of the crab's anatomy, sucking nourishment from the tissues as a plant sucks nourishment from the soil. In avoiding the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nerves and the heart the malignant thing displays such astuteness as men would arrogate to themselves alone, for by thus sparing the life of the crab it also prolongs its own. Study has shown what no one could ever have guessed—that the tumorous growth is no autochthon sprung from the failing field of the crab's own flesh but a poacher from another preserve. For when the time is ripe there takes form in the tumor a brood chamber whence a host of active little creatures emerges. Each has three pairs of appendages, a short food canal, one eye placed like that of Polyphemus in the middle of the forehead and a speck of a brain. After swimming for a time the larva goes blind and assumes the appearance of a water flea. It seeks out a crab and, burrowing through the armor to the arteries, becomes a bloodthirsty Mr. Hyde with little resemblance to its former self. Eventually it takes the form of a hernia-like sac on the belly of the crab beneath the tail, nothing now but a mass of reproductive tissue and an appetite.

Under all the diversities of parasitism certain general truths may be discerned. Any parasite that eliminates its host before it has mated and insured its own survival also eliminates itself. No one may know to what extent society has been purged by the operations of parasites who were too eager on hosts who were too weak. One only knows that parasitism like predacity works toward equilibrium. Both, like water, tend generally to seek their level, where offense and defense are balanced. Had not half of creation developed a resistance against the attacks of the other half life would long since have returned to the muck.

Despite its boon of comfort and safety to the parasite, parasitism—from an evolutionary point of view—is more baneful to him than to his host. All confirmed parasites, except the simplest one-celled plants and animals, are degenerate. They have exchanged their organs of locomotion for organs of attachment; they have subordinated all special senses to the primitive sense of touch and all special functions to the primitive functions of eating and reproducing. In so doing they have sacri-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ficed all hope of progress for themselves and their descendants, for it was Nature's plan to make easy the descent to degeneracy but impossible the return.

No one viewing the spectacle of this house of life divided against itself can fail to observe that humanity resides there too. The very name parasite, with its implication of feeding through the flattery of a host, was invented to express a human situation. No one can fail to see that the methods whereby the dumb animals exploit their fellow animals are used by man against his fellow man. Men, to be sure, do not directly consume the substance of one another but they achieve essentially the same end through such institutions as hereditary and political privilege, fraud, usury and prostitution. Yet Nature has been kind to man as to none other of her children. She has vouchsafed in his case a unique exception to an iron-clad rule, a hope for deliverance denied all other creatures. For the parasitism of men, in being more individual and imitative than racial and hereditary, is curable. The offspring of a tapeworm can only become another tapeworm but the child of a man who inherits a tapeworm's wealth and leisure need not necessarily lead a tapeworm's life. He may use the power of his mind and spirit to save his biologic honor. Mankind at large might do the same if it chose to substitute thinking for muddling through. It might even be able to turn its predatory activities away from itself and through birth control and eugenics remove the curse of civil war. But it will probably win these victories only after a sufficient number of men have grown sufficiently weary of things as they just happen to be.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Robert Owen: Backwater of History?

KENNETH M. GOULD

ROBERT OWEN belongs to that small company of socially fertile personalities of history who emerge in unexpected places as the seminal agents of great events. Eccentric, long-winded, impatient of other men's ideas, and determined to force society into the mold of his own Procrustean bed, he was not unjustly labeled by Leslie Stephen, editor of the *Dictionary of National Biography*, as "one of those intolerable bores who are the salt of the earth." And a latter-day publicist, Lytton Strachey, balanced his estimate with even greater agility when he dubbed Owen, in *Queen Victoria*, "the shrewd, gullible, high-minded, illustrious, and preposterous father of Socialism and Cooperation." He is vaguely remembered today as the founder of that Utopian Socialism in England which had little in common but the name with the so-called "scientific socialism" of Marx from which, rather than from Owen, stem the passionate cleavages of the 20th century. But to dismiss him as a curious backwater of the stream of history whom time and tide have discredited would be gravely to underestimate his force, his versatility, and his legacy to modern times. And a rehearsal of his varied contributions has definite value today for all who are concerned with the embryology of the future social order.

Owen was born in 1771 at the village of Newtown, Wales, the son of a saddler and ironmonger. Despite his unpromising surroundings his parents seem to have encouraged him to think for himself. He had the run of the libraries of the professional men of the town and early read such books as *Pilgrim's Progress*, *Paradise Lost*, *Robinson Crusoe*, Young's *Night Thoughts*, Rollin's *Ancient History*, Harvey's *Meditations Among the Tombs*, Richardson's novels and Cook's *Voyages*. His teacher knew only enough to pass on to his pupils the three

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

R's. Robert soon outstripped him and at seven was appointed a monitor over the other children. In a community where evangelical sects were strong and Papists heartily despised, the boy not only attended services of the Church of England; he was given Wesleyan tracts by well-meaning friends and in the books he read he found the tenets of Mohammedanism and other non-Christian faiths. All of them professed a monopoly of truth. To his uncompromising mind it appeared clear that the majority must be in error, indeed that "there was something wrong with all religions." And when in maturity he found his cherished plans for human amelioration checkmated by ecclesiasticism his free-thinking soon took on the color of hostility to organized religion.

Children matured young in the harsh eighteenth century. At the tender age of ten Robert left Newtown alone to seek his fortune in London where an elder brother had preceded him. Soon afterward he got himself apprenticed to a respectable linen-draper in a Lincolnshire town where he had a thorough grounding in the rudiments of business. Through many ups and downs of drudgery he found himself at eighteen in Manchester, a good judge of fabrics, eager to launch out for himself. Manchester was the center of the English textile industry, then in the throes of the Industrial Revolution. With a borrowed capital of £100, Owen went into partnership with another young man to make spinning mules. But at twenty he was hired by a wealthy merchant to superintend a cotton-spinning mill employing 500 workers, at a salary which was large for those days—£300 a year. In the beginning he knew little of the technical side of the business but when he left this post four years later, the yarns which bore his name as manager were known throughout England and Scotland for their quality and brought a premium of 50 per cent over the current price. Socially, too, he blossomed out. In a Manchester literary society he matched brains with some of the intellectuals of his time, including John Dalton, who propounded the atomic theory, and Samuel Taylor Coleridge. He was a close

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

friend of Robert Fulton, the American inventor, then in England, and advanced him funds for some of his early experiments with canal-digging machinery and steamboats.

Up to the time he was twenty-nine (1800) Owen's progress is a romance of self-help more remarkable than any Horatio Alger story. On a business trip to Glasgow he inspected the great cotton mills at the village of New Lanark and fell in love with the daughter of their owner, married her, and with his partners bought out the New Lanark mills for £60,000. Then for the first time he had an opportunity to put into practice the social ideas he had been crystallizing in his mind. There were about two thousand people in the village, solely dependent on the mills for a living. Housing and sanitation were abominable, vice and drunkenness universal. Children of six to ten labored from dawn to dark and the schooling was pitiful. Owen built second stories on the houses, ended the brutal system of pauper apprentices from foundling homes, stopped petty thieving and established decent schools. He had to contend with obstructive forces from two sides. Throughout most of the 25 years of his control at New Lanark he was hampered by the demands of his partners, hard-fisted business men not in sympathy with his humanitarian aims. He broke with several successive groups and at one time was on the verge of losing the mills entirely but in London he secured the backing of Jeremy Bentham, the Utilitarian, and a group of philanthropic Quakers who agreed to accept only a 5 per cent return on their capital.

On the other hand the workers of New Lanark were for years suspicious of this "foreigner" from England and his new-fangled ideas. They distrusted his reforms—his naive system of inspiring them to competitive sobriety by colored merit blocks at each man's post. But Owen persisted with never-failing benignity. He finally won them over when all the British cotton mills were closed in 1806 by the American embargo and Owen paid full wages during seven months of idleness.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

By 1813 New Lanark was a highly successful enterprise, a clean well-ordered town whose populace had become paragons of virtue. It was a Mecca for travelers and reformers the world over. Owen readily made friends among the celebrated and the aristocracy and his plans were favorably looked upon by the Duke of Kent (father of Victoria), Lord Sidmouth, the Prime Minister, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and many others.

He now began to formulate his theories and published his famous *Essays on the Formation of Character* or *A New View of Society*. The heart of Owen's doctrines was his fixed belief in the perfectibility of human nature. As he phrased the principle in his essays:

> Any general character, from the best to the worst, from the most ignorant to the most enlightened, may be given to any community, even to the world at large, by the application of proper means; which means are to a great extent at the command and under the control of those who have influence in the affairs of men.

"Character," he never tired of repeating, "is formed *for* and not *by* the individual." By whom or what? By environment, training, precept, experience, but never through the free will of the individual. All assumed principles (including the religious) on which society had hitherto been founded were erroneous and responsible for the chief miseries of the world. Once they were abandoned for principles of rationality and truth the condition of mankind would gradually improve without injury to any human being.

In short Owen believed (at least until late in life) that class interests are inseparable, that the privileged classes tolerate poverty and exploitation not primarily from self-interest but because they are equally subject to the defects and abuses of their birth and training. It was essentially a doctrine of *noblesse oblige*, requiring men of great talents and disinterestedness at the top. Owen had no doubt that these qualities were sufficiently widespread to organize and administer a rational society. His system was what we today should call paternalism or benevo-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lent despotism rather than democracy and wherever Owen could have complete control and supervision it worked brilliantly.

It is not difficult to foresee, therefore, that Owen would become an educational reformer. His ideas on education were extremely advanced for his day. He derived them in part from his contemporary Pestalozzi whose establishment at Yverdun, Switzerland, he visited. He sent his own sons to Hofwyl, a Pestalozzian school conducted by DeFellenberg. Owen early perceived the deficiencies of the systems of Lancaster and Bell which at that time were in great vogue in England for the education of the poorer classes inexpensively by the use of student monitors and rigid memoriter drill along with the close supervision of moral and theological doctrine by the Established Church. He anticipated Froebel in recognizing the vital importance of the earliest years of childhood and he admitted the Lanark children into his school in infancy. He eliminated most of the rote learning and religious catechism. He introduced games, dancing, singing, nature study, drawing, colored blocks and handwork of many kinds. He put little stress on books and much on the appeal to eye and ear. Friezes of painted animals on the walls inculcated an interest in natural history. Geography was demonstrated by a huge mural map on which children with long pointers located place names called out by their classmates. Owen trained his teachers in his own methods and the schools were generally conceded to be one of the outstanding triumphs of his plan even though the children were kept in school only until the age of twelve.

After the Napoleonic Wars Britain was sunk in depression, with thousands of idle demobilized soldiers, excessive poor rates, the market for war supplies destroyed, the cities filled with rioting, and mass starvation impending. The Tory government was distracted, willing to listen to any plan that promised relief. With the prestige of a successful manufacturer Owen proposed to the government that it gather the unemployed into "villages of cooperation," averaging 1200 persons, established on plots

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of arable land under efficient management, which would raise food and manufacture products for their own subsistence and sell sufficient surplus to other self-supporting communities to amortize the government's investment. These colonies were also to be centers of social improvement and rational education as at New Lanark. The scheme sounds remarkably like Upton Sinclair's "Epic" proposals for subsistence colonies of the unemployed. It was discussed in a series of public meetings in London and at Parliamentary hearings. Owen spent his time and money unsparingly to publicize the plan and for a time it was seriously considered. But the government, frightened by the mobs, adopted severe repressive measures culminating in the "Peterloo massacre." Owen, in one intemperate address attacking the churches, lost his hold on the respectable classes and became suddenly suspect.

He was carrying on, meanwhile, an unending crusade for industrial legislation, to prohibit the labor of children under ten, regulate hours of work, and set up a system of factory inspection. With Owen as prime mover and Sir Robert Peel as its chief parliamentary supporter the Factory Act of 1819 was passed. Though it fell far short of Owen's desires and was largely emasculated in Committee it was an advance that would not have been possible without his pioneering.

The American chapter of Owen's life began in 1824. His ideas were already well known in the United States where several editions of his *Essays* had been published by a "Society for Promoting Communities." Indeed it was John Quincy Adams himself, then American Minister in London, who in 1816 befriended Owen and transmitted copies of his book to President Madison, his cabinet, and the governors of the several states.

In the summer of 1824 Richard Flower, an Englishman who had lived on the Illinois frontier, came to New Lanark and told Owen an enthralling tale of a successful communistic colony in the heart of America. On the Wabash River in southwestern Indiana, then practically unbroken wilderness, a religious sect, the Rappites, had for ten years been building a com-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

munity they called Harmonie. George Rapp, born of peasant stock in Württemburg, 1757, rebelled against the religious formalism of his day, gathered a band of disciples which throve on persecution, and sailed for America in 1803. Rapp was a religious dictator but an excellent executive. He compelled the Harmonites to adopt celibacy, and after 1807 there were no more marriages in the community. On fertile flat land along the river, backed by wooded hills, the Harmonites cultivated corn, orchards, vineyards, and mulberry trees for silkworms. They built houses of brick or wood; four large community houses; a stone granary-fort; a cruciform building of brick used as a town hall and auditorium, its upper story supported by pillars of walnut, cherry, and sassafras; a silk factory, woolen mill, sawmill, brickyard, distillery, oil mill and dye works. There was also an extraordinary formal hedge garden like the maze at Hampton Court, designed by "Father" Rapp to point a religious moral. In 1824 the Rappites decided to move, and Owen's expansive temperament glowed with enthusiasm at this ready-made opportunity to test his principles in the fresh, democratic and uncorrupted air of the New World. Though his wife opposed the drastic change his eldest sons declared for New Harmony. Owen went to America in December 1824 to examine the property and three months later bought the Rappite village with all its equipment, comprising 20,097 acres, for approximately £30,000. To do so he sold his entire interest in the New Lanark mills. Caroline Owen never left Scotland but all their surviving children eventually settled in America.

When Owen arrived in America the air was electric with community experimentation. New England was teeming with such enterprises. "We are all a little wild here" wrote Emerson to Carlyle "with numberless projects of social reform. Not a reading man but has a draft of a new community in his waistcoat pocket." Owen was invited to address the Congress of the United States—an all but unprecedented honor for a foreigner. On February 25 and March 7, 1825 he delivered two addresses in the House of Representatives, before President Monroe, the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Cabinet, both houses of Congress, and the Supreme Court. Owen outlined his well-known doctrines of the formation of character, the projected community, and stressed the compatibility of his project with American democracy. Politically, he pointed out, several such communities might confederate themselves into a state, form a government, and provide for defense by military training. He concluded his lectures by issuing an invitation to "the industrious and well-disposed of all nations" to come to Indiana.

When Owen reached New Harmony in March 1825 he found it already filled to overflowing by recruits who had heard rumors of his grandiose plans. Eight hundred arrived within three months. Owen never exercised any principle of selection for his colonists—the first and perhaps the most fatal of his mistakes. Robert Dale Owen, his eldest son and one of his chief lieutenants, described them as a "heterogeneous collection of radicals, enthusiastic devotees to principle, honest latitudinarians, and lazy theorists, with a sprinkling of unprincipled sharpers thrown in." And William Owen, the second son, whom Owen left in charge during long absences called many of the Harmonists "perfect drones." Even though they got rid of some there were "still a few left." One wonders whether the curious colony on the Wabash had any influence on another great Middle Westerner of the period. Abraham Lincoln was sixteen years old at the time of the New Harmony experiment and was living less than fifty miles from New Harmony.

In the spring of 1825 the community took shape under Owen's magnetic persuasion. On April 25th he addressed the entire assemblage. The change from an individualistic to a social community could not be made overnight, he admitted, and New Harmony was to be a "half-way house." It would be necessary for some pecuniary inequality to exist because men of science must be imported. But no distinction of rank would be tolerated and Owen himself proposed to share the plain accommodations of all. Owen as founder and sole proprietor was to appoint a committee of management. At the end of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

first year the members were to elect representatives on the committee. The society was open to anybody but "persons of color." Members were to bring their own furnishings and agree to work at the trades assigned them. They should receive credit at the public store for the work they did, the books being balanced at the end of each year. But no member could withdraw his surplus credit in cash without the consent of the committee, although he could leave on a week's notice.

The New Harmony *Gazette*, which began publication in October, 1825, described the early economic activities. Manufacturing equipment was good but there were not enough skilled workmen. The sawmill, hat shop, boot shop, soap, candle and glue works were kept going to capacity; the cotton and woolen mills partly; while the dye works and pottery remained idle. Good cooks and laundresses were in demand. Owen advertised in the East for mechanics. But there was a housing shortage and it was difficult to stop the other trades to assign men to building.

Meanwhile the non-productive activities were running full blast. The tavern was always full. Owen had intended to prohibit distilling but delayed doing so, perhaps on account of popular demand. Three companies of militia, including infantry and artillery, were formed. The band was well occupied. A ball was held every Tuesday evening in the town hall and a concert every Friday. Public discussion groups met on Wednesdays and the church was open Sundays for meetings of all sects.

In November, 1825, after a summer in England, Owen returned to America with his eldest son and several disciples. In Philadelphia they acquired a motley group of intellectuals of both sexes whom Owen had invited to assist in the construction of Utopia. Foremost among them, though by no means fully in accord with Owenite ideas, was William Maclure, a transplanted Scot of independent fortune. Maclure was a geologist of distinction who had singlehanded made a geological survey of the United States, travelling on foot through the entire territory east of the Mississippi. He was a founder and long presi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dent of the Philadelphia Academy of Sciences. A friend of Pestalozzi, Maclure had also a passion for popular education and had financed schools in America taught by Pestalozzian disciples, Phiquepal d'Arusmont and Madame Marie Fretageot, whom he now proposed to take to New Harmony. Maclure agreed to advance capital for the experiment in collaboration with Owen.

Reaching Pittsburgh by stage, Owen found it necessary to purchase and refit a keelboat which he named *The Philanthropist* but which has gone down in history as the "Boatload of Knowledge." Among the 35 passengers were:

Charles Alexander Lesueur, internationally known naturalist and explorer, one of two survivors of the disastrous Peron expedition to the South Seas. His ship wrecked on the Great Reef, Lesueur had escaped to Botany Bay and remained some months in Australia where he discovered many new species among the fantastic fauna of the island continent. He was an accomplished artist as well and made exquisite paintings on vellum. Later, in New Harmony, he portrayed most of the fishes of the Middle West.

Gerard Troost, a Dutch chemist and geologist, and two Swiss artists and engravers, Thibaut and Obernasser, who played a part in Harmony's extensive book publishing. With them came also Speakman, the erudite Philadelphia pharmacist in whose shop the Philadelphia Academy of Sciences first met.

Thomas Say, who became perhaps the most brilliant naturalist of his day. Say's special fields were entomology and conchology but like most scientists of those days he was a jack of all trades. He had been naturalist of the famed Major Long expedition to the Rocky Mountains. He discovered and described (says Donald Culross Peattie) more species of shells than any other conchologist in history. He likewise classified more insects than any other man and his name is still attached to over a fourth of all species of beetles and other orders of Insectivora.

Say's magna opera, *American Conchology* (seven volumes) and *American Entomology*, were completely written, illus-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trated, engraved and printed at New Harmony—a stupendous achievement when one considers that they were the first books of their kind ever published in America and that all the presses, fonts, plates, and paper as well as the typographic skill had to be imported from the seaboard to this frontier village. It was a triumph of cooperative personnel, under the inspiration of Say, the author, Lesueur, the engraver, Mrs. Say, the water-colorist, Madame Fretageot as production manager and spark-plug and probably Maclure as financial angel. Later the New Harmony press published Michaux's *North American Sylva.*

Owen originally intended to wait three years before establishing the "community of equality." But he was so pleased upon his return with the "Boatload of Knowledge" in January 1826 that he called a general meeting to elect a committee of seven to draw up a constitution. On February 5 the constitution was finally adopted after exhaustive criticism.

Article I began with a statement of objects and a profession of faith in the "New Harmony Community of Equality." All were to be members of one family, with no occupational distinctions. Similar food, clothing, education and housing were to be provided for all. The community was to be divided into six departments: Agriculture; Manufactures; Literature, Science and Education; Domestic Economy; General Economy; Commerce. Each department was subdivided into occupations. Each occupational group was to choose an "intendent," they in turn to choose four "superintendents." These and the officers constituted an Executive Council. Real estate was to be vested in the community as a whole. No longer should there be any differential credit at the stores. Each member was to give labor according to his ability and to receive goods according to need.

The constitution operated spasmodically. There were many dissenters who objected to the system of representative government as leading to jealousy, inequality and factions. Two weeks later the assembly resolved to ask Owen to superintend affairs personally for one year. Under him a degree of regularity and efficiency in all departments ensued and if he had not ab-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sented himself for long periods the outcome might have been different. Idleness and bickering were dispelled. A writer in the New Harmony *Gazette*, William Pelham, said of Owen: "He is an extraordinary man—such a one as the world has never before seen. His wisdom, comprehensive mind, practical knowledge, but above all, his openness, candour, and sincerity have no parallel in ancient or modern history."

The school was naturally one of Owen's principal concerns. It provided for 130 children, even to feeding and clothing them, mostly at Owen's expense. Outsiders paid fees. Maclure soon took entire charge, under the name of the Education Society. He proposed to teach trades and occupations by a sort of apprenticeship system. There was an experimental farm of 900 acres with a large building for workshops and a hall for the museum and lectures. It was divided into three age groups: those between two and five years under Madame Fretageot; those between five and twelve under Joseph Neef, an Alsatian veteran of the Napoleonic wars who had worked with Pestalozzi and whose five daughters and sons also taught; and the older children under Phiquepal d'Arusmont, who taught useful arts and mathematics and in six weeks produced goods worth $900. Owen's sons assisted and the scientists Say, Troost, and Lesueur gave lessons in natural history, chemistry and drawing. The children were thoroughly regimented but seemed happy and busy in useful work. Military training was instituted for the older boys.

Charles Bernard, Grand Duke of Saxe-Weimar-Eisenach, visited New Harmony in 1826 and recorded in his diary many acute observations. Already he saw signs of divisiveness. He was impressed by the extreme frugality of living and amazed at Owen's invulnerable belief in the success of the project. A distinctive community dress had been adopted—wide pantaloons buttoned over a sort of jacket. The difficulty of amalgamating various social grades was evident, for though everybody attended social and cultural affairs the classes arising from previous status still naturally flocked together.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The society was too large and heterogeneous to work smoothly. There were not only persistent social inequalities but religious and even national differences. Owen's thrift was in constant conflict with the extravagant and unproductive habits of the colonists. Minute accounts were kept of all production and consumption. There was also the problem of discipline among the children and older boys. The doctrine of "no praise or blame, no rewards or punishments" was not always effective. Robert Dale Owen, who threw himself wholeheartedly into all sorts of menial occupations, settled down to teaching the older boys and editing the *Gazette*. Maclure was critical of many impractical arrangements.

It was eventually decided to divide the land into small, self-supporting communities of about 1200 acres each. One called Macluria was established partly on religious grounds. Another, Feiba Peveli, consisted of English country folk. Both societies had similar constitutions, with the executive powers vested in non-elective "councils of fathers" consisting of the five oldest men under the age of 65. The measures by which real estate was to be transferred to the communities were not clearly stated but apparently the members bound themselves to eventual purchase from Owen at a price of about $85 an acre with seven years' credit for payment. Owen finally chose 25 men who signed a contract with him and Maclure. The parent community was dissolved in March 1827 and all persons who did not join one of the daughter communities were warned to leave. Many did, with their feelings hurt.

An editorial by the Owen sons in the *Gazette* about this time is practically a confession of failure. They called it a "bold but premature experiment to ascertain whether a mixed and unassorted population could successfully govern their own affairs." Owen, believing the new communities well established, went to England for the summer. He said he would like to continue the schools without cost to the colonists but could no longer bear the expense, though he left $3,000 for it. He returned to New Harmony the next winter and gave a valedictory

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

address in which he seemed convinced the experiment was a failure. He now found "that habits of the individual system were so powerful that the leases have been mostly used for individual gain and must return to my hands." He referred to numerous breaches of contract including the establishment of monopolies, competitive stores and whisky shops. He lost much property through unscrupulous speculators and had a serious quarrel over finances with Maclure who apparently was indebted to Owen for $5,000.

The community relapsed into individualism, Owen and Maclure selling or leasing small lots. Owen reserved some land for himself but finally deeded the balance to one of his sons. He lost in the whole experiment over £40,000—more than four-fifths of his entire capital. On June 22, 1828 Robert Owen quit New Harmony, though he crossed the Atlantic many times afterward.

One of the many remarkable characters attracted to New Harmony by Owen was the versatile Yankee, Josiah Warren, then a young orchestra leader in Cincinnati. Warren bore his share of the community's labors for two years in an inquiring spirit. Convinced that communism failed for lack of individual responsibility he then turned from Owenism to a species of philosophical anarchy. In Cincinnati he opened his first "equity" or "time" store, in which prices were based on cost of production plus a varying sum charged for the storekeeper's time in handling, measured by a clock on the counter. He was a highly original inventor of printing machinery, including the first continuous roll cylinder press and a process for stereotyping plates.

New Harmony continued for more than a generation the chief scientific and educational center of the Middle West. After the disintegration of the community many of the colonists remained and their descendants left a permanent stamp on the town. Especially strong was the influence on Owen's four sons of whom Robert Dale became distinguished as a statesman, Richard and David as geologists. This afterglow was

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

touched by a certain serenity of life and a respect for creative achievement and social idealism. The first woman's club in America and many other pioneer ideas sprouted there. William Maclure founded the Workingmen's Institute and Public Library and left most of his estate for the establishment of 160 similar libraries in Indiana and Illinois. New Harmony was different from other towns, conscious of its heritage and proud of its traditions. Peattie says:

> The golden age at New Harmony did not begin until all political and philanthropic agitations had ebbed away and grass grew again in the streets. Learned men continued to flock westward to this goal; the meetings of the Philadelphia Academy of Sciences became so enfeebled by the exodus of naturalists as to be scarcely worth attending. In the period of 1827 to 1875, New Harmony was a spot to which many of the greatest scientists of Europe made curious or respectful pilgrimages, and the name of New Harmony meant more than New York to the great conchologists, entomologists, geologists and paleobotanists of Paris, Nürnberg, Bremen, Kiel, Krefeld, and Cambridge. For some time the New Harmony Post Office ranked second in Indiana.

Trees planted by Maclure and Say glorify New Harmony to this day—osage oranges, osiers, locusts and "golden rain" trees (Koelreuteria) which shed their shower of yellow blossoms in the spring of each year. The dust of Thomas Say lies buried in the yard of the memorial museum under a simple monument.

The wave of community experimentation which began in the 1820's did not end with Owen. Frances Wright founded a community at Yellow Springs, Ohio, and another, for Negroes, at Nashoba in western Tennessee. There were at least a dozen such communities in the Middle West which owed their inspiration to Owen's doctrines. Another stream of influence, that of French Fourierism, culminated in the establishment of over forty "phalanxes" in the United States in the decade 1840 to 1850. It attracted within its orbit such illustrious adherents as Bronson Alcott, Albert Brisbane, Parke Godwin, George Ripley, Charles A. Dana, Horace Greeley, Nathaniel Hawthorne, and Margaret Fuller and its chief experiment stations were

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Brook Farm in Massachusetts and the North American Phalanx in New Jersey.

The Fourierist colonies, benefiting by Owenite experience, on the whole lasted longer but succumbed to the same inherent weaknesses that seemed to attend all communities based on secular humanitarianism alone without a strong admixture of authoritarian religious control. As one observer said of Owen's colony: "Communism must be ruled either by law or grace. He abolished law, and did not employ grace."

The numerous relatively successful colonies of Mennonite and Dunkard sects, like those of the Rappites, underscore the point. So too, in fact, does that most conspicuous and persistent of American colonies, the Oneida Community, which for over three decades (1848-1879) conducted, under the benevolent dictatorship of that arch religious Perfectionist, John Humphrey Noyes, its extraordinary innovations in sexual and communal morality. Noyes was familiar with Owenism but though paralleling Owen's methods in many ways drew little of his philosophy from them. He condemned Robert Dale Owen's advanced sex ethics founded on the use of contraceptives (advocated in Owen's book, *Moral Physiology*) in favor of his own peculiar system of "male continence" and "stirpiculture."

We may glance for a moment at the few remaining incidents of Owen's association with America. Financially depleted but apparently never disillusioned he devoted considerable time and effort to promoting a community in Mexico. Through the Mexican minister to London he sought from the Mexican government the grant of the entire provinces of Coahuila and Texas. In October 1828 he sailed for Vera Cruz. Reaching Mexico City he had an audience with General Santa Anna and was promised a strip of land 150 miles wide from sea to sea but with the stipulation, demanded by Owen, that the Mexican Congress should grant complete religious freedom within the territory. This the Congress refused to do and Owen's Mexican venture died stillborn.

Returning via New Orleans he travelled in April, 1829 to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Cincinnati where he had engaged a year before to challenge any American clergyman in public debate on religion. The Reverend Alexander Campbell of Bethany, West Virginia, leader of the Disciples of Christ, accepted his challenge. They met upon the platform of a Methodist church in Cincinnati where for eight days from nine in the morning until late evening the disputants spoke alternately for a half hour each before a breathless audience of a thousand men and women. Owen had challenged with his old familiar propositions that all religions were founded on ignorance and were the source of evil and the foe of progress. Owen's share of the argument consisted of long expositions of his system, the "twelve fundamental laws of human nature" and the perfect society. Campbell's was a learned apologetic for Christianity based on great research in theological doctrine yet it was not without quizzical gibes at Owen's inconsistencies. That enterprising traveller, Mrs. Frances Trollope, mother of Anthony and author of *Domestic Manners of the Americans*, attended the Owen-Campbell debate and gives us a most amusing picture of the affair, concluding with the comment:

> It was said that at the end of the fifteen meetings the numerical amount of the Christians and the Infidels of Cincinnati remained exactly what it was when they began. . . . All this I think could only have happened in America. I am not quite sure that it was very desirable that it should have happened anywhere.

From Cincinnati Owen travelled to Washington where he interviewed President Jackson and Secretary of State Van Buren to discuss the strained relations which then existed between the United States and Great Britain. On his return to England he sought out Lord Aberdeen, the Foreign Minister, and was instrumental in arranging terms of settlement, which continued amicable until the Oregon dispute some years later, when Owen again intervened.

Of the remaining chapters of Owen's long life we need say little. Having lost his upper and middle class support and dissipated most of his fortune he was gradually forced into closer

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

relations with working class movements as the main hope for his never-ending reforms. Three more cooperative colonies, in England, Scotland, and Ireland repeated the failure of New Harmony. But trades unionism and the Rochdale cooperative groups found in him a powerful champion. By 1833 he was at the head of a strong labor movement, the Grand National Consolidated Trades Union. Feared as revolutionary by the economic and political powers it was met with lockouts and savage repressive tactics. Within a year of its formation it was shattered. Though he lived through the period of Chartism his influence was gone. But he continued for twenty years working tirelessly and giving all his substance to the spread of "Equitable Labor Exchanges" for the promotion of cooperative distribution.

Though Robert Owen's weaknesses made him, after his early success, an apparently futile and ineffective leader he was, by the general testimony of those who knew him, a most lovable man, without a trace of self-seeking and guilelessly devoted to the welfare of his fellow men. Apart from his undoubted genius for large-scale industrial management Owen will probably be remembered chiefly for his educational principles, which foreshadowed much of our present day school technique, and for his persistent efforts toward a better life for all workers. In a time when even the most enlightened employers considered their duty done with the payment of a wage pittance barely large enough to keep body and soul together, Owen made the condition of his working force the first charge upon industry. Accepting a modest return on his capital he devoted the entire surplus to social services and demonstrated to the English-speaking world that machine industry can succeed without wringing blood-money from the sweat of labor. His communistic colonies, his trades unions, his cooperative exchanges all failed in the immediate and practical sense. But he laid foundations on which later generations of mass movements learned to build.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Goliath . . . Now David

ERNEST H. WILKINS

IN THE title of *The American Scholar* the noun is fundamental and the adjective is casual. Scholarship, as such, is one, and refuses nationalism. Yet the adjective is in place as a statement of the chances of locality and suggests no barriers. The word "American" does not bristle: it beckons.

It has beckoned, long since, to many for whom their native lands have ceased to provide a possible home. So, recently, it has beckoned to Salvemini, to Ascoli, to Borgese. They have been and they will be essentially scholars. It is our gain that the local adjective for their scholarship is now "American."

Exile is no unusual scene for literary activity. Indeed an extraordinary number of the world's significant works of literary character have been written in exile or in prison—or have reflected the experiences of exile or of prison. Taking Italy alone, with Ovid and St. Paul as pagan and Christian precedents, one thinks of Marco Polo, Brunetto Latina, Cavalcanti, Dante—the greatest *fuoruscito* of them all—Cellini, Tasso, Foscolo, Pellico, Mazzini. Many minor names might be added: that of Gabriele Rossetti may serve to represent them.

Similar instances among writers of other lands will occur to every reader. It may well be that the frequency of this phenomenon is more than casual. Creativity, if it be really vital and true to itself, is not likely to acquiesce too tamely in the order of things as they are. And when that order is militant in its own conformism either creativity or the creator is likely to suffer. I commend this theme to the research of some student of literature—of literature without a national adjective.

When literary activity has continued in exile the writing has usually been done in the language of the fatherland. Brunetto, exceptionally, wrote the *Livres dou Trésor* in the language of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the country of his refuge. In recent years, in England and America, there have been many cases of distinguished writing in English by men who, whether through political tragedy or of their own free will, have come from continental Europe—or from the Orient—to cast their lots with us. One thinks of Conrad and of Rölvaag. And the field of scholarship, particularly the field of political scholarship, shows notable examples. This also is a theme which would reward research (especially perhaps with reference to differences in style and even in thought resulting from the adoption of a different linguistic medium).

One may say with assurance that Borgese's *Goliath*[1] is the most notable work of letters ever written in English by an Italian. It is indeed, from the point of view of his sheer power over the language, an amazing book. It is almost impeccable in terms of ordinary usage, but it is better than impeccable. Borgese does exciting things with English words which no Englishman or American would ever have thought of doing: yet they are excellently well done. I should recommend the book to the reading of anyone interested in the possibilities of English style even though he might have little or no interest in the history of Italian literature or in Fascism.

Goliath, of course, is Fascism: the book is slung as David slung his stone. The greater part of the book is a minute and passionate narrative of the rise and the march of Fascism—a narrative undertaken in the double hope that it may somehow contribute to the weakening of Fascism in Italy and that it may in some measure check the march of Fascism on the world.

Borgese does not claim to write with historical objectivity. He writes with the fire of a brilliant novelist, interpreting, personalizing, dramatizing. And he writes as one whose own life has been seared by the dread thing of which he writes. No one should take this book as his sole account of Fascism; but no one concerned with Fascism should miss the revelatory achievements of this book. Its passion is not uncontrolled; for Borgese was first of all a critic and retains his basic habits of observa-

[1] *Goliath: The March of Fascism*, by G. A. Borgese, New York, The Viking Press, 1937.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion and analysis. He chooses his own emphases, his palette has no color that is not intense, his narrative and his characters may be pulled out of proportion here and there by the sheer power of his satire; but for all his suffering and his indignation his eyes have been clear and his lips speak the truth as he has seen it.

That truth is terrible enough, terrible as an army with fasces, an army marching successively on Rome, on Corfu, on the Vatican, on scholarship, on Geneva, on Addis Ababa, on Madrid, on the world. Borgese's Appendix carries the story up to last August: he might have prophesied Roumania and Brazil. The chapter dealing with the fate of scholarship forms a passionate parallel to Professor Ascoli's essay in the Winter number of *The American Scholar*. But the fate of scholarship is only one phase of a totalitarian fate, whose most spectacular and most menacing feature is the glorification of war.

Novelist that he is, Borgese writes in terms of persons and gives to his persons a fullness of being which is more characteristic of the novel than of history. His protagonists are d'Annunzio and Mussolini. I venture to think that Borgese overrates the importance of d'Annunzio both as poet and as man of action. D'Annunzio has lived and has exulted in the spotlight, but I believe that literary history will eventually give him only a minor paragraph and that political history will eventually mention him only in the course of a brief reference to Fiume.

As to the importance of Mussolini there can be no doubt; and Borgese's portrait of him is therefore of the utmost interest. Many other portraits have been done and will be done. This, the portrait by the critic-novelist, will stand with the best of them, alive with flashes of sinister light and shadow which no other portrait will contain. The person thus revealed is essentially an anarchist, consistent only in his contempt for liberty and for democracy, ruthless in the attainment and maintenance of power for his own sake.

To his narrative of the march of Fascism Borgese prefixes a survey of Italian literature as an aid to understanding the rise

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Fascism. I am immensely grateful for the survey, but I do not think that it helps very much in the understanding of Fascism.

Indeed while Borgese's book gives a tremendous picture of Fascism as it is, and while it certainly intensifies the will to resist Fascism, I do not think that it does as much as it might do, or as Salvemini does, to help one understand the actual development of Fascism. As Borgese himself says, Fascism could hardly have arisen except in a certain special combination of conditions—and might so easily have been stopped at the start. The only precipitate which could be thought to carry over from Italian literature is the single element of nationalism; and my own belief, based largely on Salvemini, is that nationalism was a secondary rather than a primary element in Fascism, used as a device by the leaders of Fascism to win the enthusiasm of the more idealistic among their younger followers. I would not deny that the reading of Dante and Petrarch and Leopardi would sensitize Italian youth to the call of Italy—but I do think that the elements derived by Fascism from Italian literature are secondary and partial rather than primary and general. The first chapters of Borgese's book would lead one to think that the history of Italian literature was the best approach to the understanding of Fascism. That I do not believe to be the case.

Yet these first chapters had to be written, for the whole book is an outpouring of that which is most vital to Borgese; and his profound familiarity with the great wealth of Italian literature is woven into the substance of his vitality.

A judgment similar to that made above for the work as a whole would seem to me fair for the chapters on Italian literature: no one should derive his knowledge of Italian literature exclusively or primarily from these chapters, but no one concerned with Italian literature should miss these chapters. Many of the perceptions and characterizations are very fine; and here sometimes one may enjoy the pure shining of that brilliance which in the later chapters, flashing still, is wielded as a weapon.

Between this exile and the greatest of his predecessors there

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is much in common. Dante too was a master of satire, used with artistic control and for great public ends. Borgese, as truly as Dante, might have written: *Nos autem, cui mundus est patria.* And as Dante, because of his love, passionately chastened the Florence he loved, so too the lashes of Borgese's scourge are drawn from love for Italy. And though Borgese's narrative yields no relief from Phlegethon his spirit rises, at the end, in pages of high eloquence.

Professor Borgese now holds the chair of Italian Literature at the University of Chicago, the chair which I once held—and held dear. I hope that the bread of the Quadrangle Club will never taste of salt to him and that the stairs of Wieboldt Hall may seem to him his own and not *l'altrui scale.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Archeology Confronts Biblical Criticism

W. F. ALBRIGHT

IN THE eighties of the past century the so-called "higher criticism" gained a foothold in American theological circles. At first its progress was marked by a chain of trials for heresy in which professors of Old Testament in Protestant theological seminaries were almost invariably the defendants. Since practically all competent scholars were soon numbered among the adherents of the critical school of biblical interpretation, it was not long before the new point of view had obtained the victory in all colleges and universities where departments of Semitics or of Biblical Literature existed, as well as in nearly all the more liberal or more progressive seminaries. The University of Chicago was most successful in its propaganda for critical teaching of the Bible, owing mainly to the enthusiastic activity of its first president, William Rayney Harper, who had come to Chicago from the chair of Hebrew at Yale. For many years the conservatives have fought a losing battle with fewer and fewer men of scholarly training on their side. At present there are only one or two Protestant institutions of recognized scholarly standing in America which still adhere to the conservative view of the Old Testament and among them Princeton Theological Seminary indisputably ranks first. In Jewish circles we have nearly the same situation.

What is the "higher criticism" of the Bible? To answer this question, which is quite in place again now that a generation has passed since it was in the foreground of religious and intellectual interest, we must briefly sketch its history. The late 17th century saw the birth of a rational treatment of historical data, a treatment which recognized the importance of credibility according to Cartesian norms in narratives of historical fact,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and which at the same time analyzed the sources and transmission of such narratives. This rationalizing attitude appears with Hobbes in his *Leviathan* (1651), with Spinoza in his *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus* (1671) and less significantly with Simon in his *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* (1682). But it was the renowned English classical scholar, Richard Bentley, once said by Newton to be the only man who had really understood the *Principia*, whose brilliant demonstration of the spurious character of the "Epistles of Phalaris" (1699) first showed how ancient documents should be analyzed by the critical historian. In the 18th century systematic methods of historical criticism were gradually introduced—not, as one might suppose, by Voltaire and the Encyclopedists, who were just as uncritical as they were rationalistic, but by isolated scholars in England and Germany. Among the latter we may single out Conyers Middleton, whose *Free Inquiry*, (1748) introduced and popularized the historico-critical treatment of Patristic literature, and Friedrich Wolf, who founded the discipline of critical philology in Germany and whose *Prolegomena* (1795) to Homer initiated the higher criticism of the Iliad and Odyssey.

The foundation having thus been laid, the new principles were applied to the Old Testament by a brilliant succession of trained German Hebraists and Orientalists—all "Aryan" Christians despite repeated anti-Semitic statements to the contrary. Landmarks in this development are the appearance of Eichhorn's *Einleitung* (1780-83), of De Wette's *Beiträge* (1806-07) and of a series of publications (1865-1878) by Graf, Kuenen and Wellhausen. Julius Wellhausen put the critical analysis of the Pentateuch into the standard form which was gradually accepted by most competent Protestant scholars throughout the world as well as by an increasing number of Jewish writers and (with significant modifications) by many influential Catholic exegetes, especially in France

In its conclusions with regard to the Old Testament the standard higher critical school diverges from the older "ortho-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dox" point of view (which must be sharply distinguished from the more extreme "fundamentalist" position, recently popularized in this country) in the following important respects: 1. biblical literature is to be subjected to exactly the same methods of analysis and interpretation as are applied to other literatures; 2. the religious institutions of Israel passed through three Hegelian stages of evolution, pre-prophetic, prophetic, and legal; 3. Israelite monotheism did not go back to Moses (before 1200 B.C.) but was the result of a slow evolution, being clearly formulated in the 8th century and fully developed in the 6th century B.C.; 4. in their present form the first six or more historical books of the Bible are a compilation of four main documents designated as J, E, D, P, which were written down between 900 and 450 B.C.; 5. the non-prophetic poetry of the Bible (Psalms, Proverbs, Job, etc.) is almost entirely postexilic (i.e. it was written after the Babylonian Exile in the 6th century B.C.).

Being based on such minutely accurate philological analysis that it often became hair-splitting, and yielding a consistent scheme of development which agreed in the most satisfactory way with the then dominant Hegelian philosophy of history, it is not surprising that the system of Wellhausen became authoritative in almost all serious intellectual circles throughout the world. Meanwhile traditionalist apologetics became increasingly inferior and often degenerated to such depths as are illustrated in recent volumes of the *Transactions of the Victoria Institute*, founded by Gladstone in honor of Queen Victoria and for the purpose of harmonizing science and religion. With what inconsistency the Institute has steered its course may be gauged from the fact that the late M. G. Kyle was severely attacked for reading a paper in which he held that the first man was ignorant of all the arts, possessing only native skill, while on another occasion a paper by G. M. Price, who believes that geological strata and fossils represent a chaotic condition resulting from Noah's flood, was rebuked because it threw overboard all the parallels between Victorian geology and the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

first chapter of Genesis! The apologetic of the Victoria Institute has at least been orthodox; much so-called apologetic is not really conservative in its tendency but often reflects a point of view more remote from traditional orthodoxy than the latter is from moderate Wellhausenism.

By now the reader doubtless considers the writer an extreme liberal, full of enthusiasm for the triumph of scholarship, as represented by Wellhausenism, over obscurantist orthodoxy. Actually this is not true, and the writer's position is as far removed from the former as it is from the latter, as will become clear in the coming pages. What has occurred to make such a reaction possible? There are three principal causes: the unprecedented development of Near Eastern archeology, the change in the philosophical interpretation of history and the shift in theological emphasis. Of these the first is by far the most important since it is concrete, not speculative.

When Eichhorn and De Wette founded the discipline of biblical higher criticism the possibilities of archeology were wholly unknown. Not a single script or language of the pre-Christian Orient had been deciphered; not an excavation had been begun. By 1878 (when the publication of Wellhausen's *Prolegomena* brought the definitive formulation of the new system) Egyptian hieroglyphics, Assyro-Babylonian cuneiform, the Phoenician and South-Arabian alphabets had been deciphered, inscriptions were being read with some approach to a correct understanding of their contents and numerous excavations had been undertaken in Egypt and Mesopotamia. Nearly all the latter were, however, simply organized hunts for museum pieces. No excavations had been undertaken anywhere in Palestine except at Jerusalem. The science of stratigraphic and comparative archeology was unknown. The application of philological method to the newly-deciphered languages had hardly begun, there were no satisfactory grammars or dictionaries and translation was hardly more than clever guessing—in short, the light shed by archeological discoveries on the background of the Bible was so fitful that archeology might just as well

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not have existed. Even a generation ago it might have been held with some reason that very little of the material unearthed was relevant to the studies of the biblical scholar.

Now everything has changed. The lands of the Biblical Orient have yielded countless millions of artifacts, largely found in their original stratigraphical context and therefore datable. Hundreds of thousands of inscriptions in scores of scripts and languages have been deciphered and interpreted. Yet, it may be observed in passing, the day of diminishing returns has not yet dawned since we have not begun to exhaust the phases of culture or types of artifact buried in many thousand mounds and surface ruins (not one hundredth of which has been even partially dug) and since a new script or language is almost invariably discovered whenever one is deciphered. We have admirable grammars and dictionaries of the better-known and more important languages, so that a specialist can now read Egyptian or Babylonian as well as the average Latinist can read a Latin document.

Moreover none of this vast mass of data can any longer be safely called irrelevant to the student of biblical history and culture. It is now becoming possible to combine the details into a synthesis, thanks to which we can at last set the history and literature of Israel in their proper perspective and can see them as parts of the great cultural whole formed by the lands of the Eastern Mediterranean basin and the Tigris-Euphrates valley. Since every new advance in interpretation brings corresponding progress in related fields the results of previously isolated investigations may be combined and applied to the solution of problems which have hitherto defied elucidation. It is not too bold to say that each year of research in the field of biblical archeology during the past ten years has been, on the average, as productive as a whole decade in the 19th century.

The scholar finds himself in an anomalous position as soon as he turns from Egypt and Mesopotamia to Palestine and Syria. Virtually all his comparative data from the former lands are derived from written documents and mural reliefs whereas

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nearly all the material from the latter consists of building remains and artifacts without writing or pictorial representations. It is true that the unprecedented development of comparative archeology during the past decade has made it possible to use such materials for the direct reconstruction of history but the comparative lack of excavated written documents from Israel and its immediate neighbors remains an obstacle to the investigator of the backgrounds of biblical literature. The biblical scholar who wishes to control his source-material must be philologist in dealing with extra-Palestinian data and comparative archeologist as soon as he turns to utilize Palestinian discoveries. In other words a man whose aim is to be a productive, critical historian of Israel must not only be a master of many complex systems of writing and of the varied languages which employed them, together with the philological methods by which they are interpreted, but he must also be familiar with the stratigraphical and typological technique of the modern archeologist. Since men of such training are exceedingly rare and of unequal ability one can hardly expect the most ambitious biblical scholar to attempt to control more than one of the two main fields; either he will be philologist and not archeologist or the reverse. Now, thanks especially to the recent publication of inscriptions in Hebrew at Samaria (1924; 1933-) and Lachish (1935-), and to the partial recovery of the oldest Phoenician (Canaanite) literature at Ugarit (1929-), the philologist also has an opportunity to make direct contributions to the recovery of ancient Palestine.

Archeological and inscriptional data have established the historicity of innumerable passages and statements of the Old Testament; the number of such cases is many times greater than those where the reverse has been proved or has been made probable. A great many literary parallels have been found and their number is increasing very rapidly, owing to the rich new Canaanite material from Ugarit. Small wonder that archeology plays a dominant part in recent apologetics and that the majority of archeologists take a much more conservative attitude toward

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the historical records of Israel than do philologically trained men. On the other hand this reaction is so often accompanied by a painful lack of critical spirit that archeological apologetics is regarded with suspicion by serious scholars.

Turning to the second cause of the reaction toward a more conservative position—the change in the philosophical interpretation of history—it must again be stressed that the critical school of Wellhausen was dominated by an Hegelian concept of historical development from which his followers have never freed themselves. If archeological investigation has done nothing else for the philosopher it has at least helped to demonstrate the artificiality of all Hegelian and Neo-Hegelian systems, even when they are as modified as at the hands of Croce or as caricatured as in the systems of Marx or Spengler. The cultural evolution of man is fundamentally a biological phenomenon and as such it is organic and indeterminate rather than schematic and determinate. Archeology has doubled the known duration of self-conscious human history besides filling innumerable gaps in our knowledge of the past two and a half millennia; it has trebled the length of time through which we can follow the evolution of sedentary communities; it has multiplied the span of man's history as a species at least 20 times. The progress of arts and crafts, of ideas and institutions proves to have been far more irregular than generally realized; evolution does not follow Hegelian formulas but is an organic process of infinite complexity. Such clichés as Vico's *corsi e ricorsi* and Hegel's (originally Fichte's) "thesis, antithesis and synthesis" explain nothing, but merely describe ineluctable principles of all activity, which recur as often as there are connected chains of happenings. In the light of the ancient Orient nothing seems more artificial and contrary to analogy than the postulated evolution of Hebrew religion within the limits of time and circumstance allowed by the school of Wellhausen. The social psychology and the thought-patterns of the Egypto-Mesopotamian world both stand in striking contrast to those of early Israel as reconstructed by the members of this school.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Illustrations of the point just made are many; I shall restrict myself to a few. Wellhausen himself was one of the foremost Arabists of his day and he greatly exaggerated the resemblance between the Hebrews of the Mosaic age and the pagan Arabs of the "Time of Ignorance," nearly 2000 years later. We now know that these Hebrews were not nomadic Bedouin at all but belonged to a distinct group of semi-nomadic type whose wanderings were restricted to relatively settled areas. A second idea of this school, that primitive elements in Israelite culture reflect a generally primitive state of culture, is quite unhistorical; sporadic survivals of beliefs and customs are found in Egypt and Mesopotamia side by side with very advanced forms of culture and thought. A third assumption, that pious fraud and pseudepigraphy were common in Israel, is without parallel in the pre-Hellenistic Orient. What we find in the latter is just the opposite—a superstitious veneration both for the written word and for oral tradition. Stupid blunders in copying texts abound; there are many additions, changes and combinations due to false historical or other theories; but there is hardly a single known case of *pia fraus*. In Greek times, of course, the situation altered radically in this respect.

Third in my list of causes is the shift in theological emphasis. The past 60 years have seen a striking decline in the place of the Bible in Protestant churches. Liberals generally consider it as an interesting relic or at most as an instructive historical document; conservatives treat it as a repository of "proof-texts" and few of them know much about it otherwise, as the writer has repeatedly discovered, much to his initial surprise. In passing it is very interesting to note that the same period has seen a considerable practical change in the place held by the Bible in Catholic circles, a tendency which is well indicated by the steady improvement in the quality of Catholic biblical scholarship. Among Jews the situation is somewhat different since the Bible retains its central place in Zionist teaching, because of its value as the record of early Jewish nationalism and as the great classic of Hebrew literature.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Protestant shift away from the Bible has led to a pronounced reaction. The weakness of liberal Protestantism as a religious force is more and more evident and as a result strong movements to rehabilitate historic Christian theology, including necessarily the biblical source of the latter, are setting in. This reaction is best illustrated by the Barthian movement, which is authoritarian but in no sense obscurantist—e.g. it does not try to explain away the more assured results of modern biblical and historical research. Finally, there is increasing recognition of the historical character of Judaism and Christianity, both of which are unthinkable without their past and both of which are ideologically part of it. Both must follow the general direction of their historical evolution or will vanish from the scene. The orthogenetic principle of historical continuity was once stressed by the distinguished Zionist thinker and publicist, Joseph Klausner, when he told a Unitarian friend of the writer over 15 years ago that the Unitarians were doomed to extinction because they had diverged too far from the normal direction of Christian evolution!

The writer is by no means alone in his reaction against the dominant school of biblical scholarship. The movement began, in fact, in the land where this school arose and first triumphed. Sixteen years ago the late Rudolf Kittel, the foremost biblical historian of Germany, publicly declared that he felt very doubtful about the conclusions of the Wellhausen school, because of the weakness of their foundation and because of the steadily widening discrepancy between them and the data from the ancient Orient. Among German Old Testament scholars holding more or less conservative positions, as measured by the standards of the Wellhausen school, may be mentioned A. Alt of Leipzig, who is the ablest biblical historian of our day, E. Sellin and J. Hempel of Berlin, M. Noth of Königsberg, A. Jirku of Bonn and F. Böhl in Leiden (Holland), where Kuenen taught. Of course these scholars cannot be said to represent a single school and few of them are quite as conservative as the writer, who is most sympathetic toward the school of Alt. We

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

do not for a moment deny the lasting value of the critical work accomplished by our predecessors; Wellhausen still ranks in our eyes as the greatest biblical scholar of the 19th century. But his standpoint is antiquated and his picture of the early evolution of Israel is sadly distorted.

In giving illustrations of the change of attitude that has become necessary the writer must limit himself for lack of space to the Pentateuch—always the storm-center in the century and a half which have passed. Since the first five books of the Bible contain most of the extant traditions of early Hebrew history, the full account of Moses' career, and nearly all that is known of Israelite and early Jewish family, religious, and ceremonial law, the reason for their significance is clear. The writer will briefly consider the traditions of the Patriarchal Age, the origin of monotheism in Israel and the origin and character of Mosaic law.[1] Wellhausen and his school took for granted that the traditions of Genesis regarding the fathers of Israel reflected conditions in the time of the Monarchy, a good millennium later than their traditional date. The continued excavation and publication of documents from the second millennium has proved, time after time, that the historical, typographical, social and even linguistic background of these stories is very much earlier than the time of the Monarchy (10th-7th centuries B.C.). Of particular interest is the discovery by Speiser and Gordon of many striking social and legal parallels between the stories of the Patriarchs and the Horite documents from Nuzu in eastern Mesopotamia, dating mainly from the 15th century B.C. The sensational discovery by Parrot in 1935-7 of nearly 30,000 cuneiform tablets at Mari on the Middle Euphrates, belonging to the 20th century B.C., promises even more remarkable results, especially since the inhabitants of Mari were closely related to the early Hebrews, as we know from their personal names though the documents are written in Babylonian. M.

[1] For further development of the writer's position in these matters see his *Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible* (third edition, New York, 1935), pp. 129-169, 205-218, 239-243; *Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands* (in the new edition of Young's *Analytical Concordance*, New York, 1936), pp. 21-31; *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1936, pp. 164-69.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dossin's first announcement (summer of 1937) of the contents of these tablets shows that they will completely revolutionize our knowledge of the period.[2] In this connection it may be said that writing was well known in Palestine and Syria throughout the Patriarchal Age (Middle Bronze, 2100-1500 B.C.). No fewer than five scripts are known to have been in use: Egyptian hieroglyphs, used for personal and place names by the Canaanites; Accadian cuneiform; the hieroglyphiform syllabary of Phoenicia, used from the 23rd century or earlier (as known since 1935); the linear alphabet of Sinai, three inscriptions in which are now known from Palestine (this script seems to be the direct progenitor of our own); the cuneiform alphabet of Ugarit (used also a little later in Palestine), which was discovered in 1929. This means that Hebrew historical traditions need not have been handed down through oral transmission alone.

Secondly I shall touch on the origin of monotheism. The only time in the history of the ancient Near East when we find monotheism in the leading cultural centers, Egypt and Babylonia, is about the 14th century B.C.; it is also then that we find the closest approach to monotheism in Syria and Asia Minor. Since it is now an historical commonplace that we find similar ideas emerging simultaneously in different parts of a given cultural continuum we should expect to find Israelite monotheism somehow emerging about that time. Then the ancient Orient was bound together by ties of material culture and international relationship which are vividly illustrated by the objects which emerge from a Late Bronze site and by the letters from the archives of Egypt, Palestine, Syria and Asia Minor. But this is precisely the age of Moses, who must be dated between 1350 and 1250 B.C.[3] Moreover the following Early Iron Age was characterized by intense particularism, without a

[2] In a letter to the writer from Mari, dated Nov. 14, 1937, M. Parrot describes even more sensational discoveries, adding "*Ce n'est pas encore la mention d'Abraham mais presque . . .*"

[3] This follows from the late J. L. Starkey's discoveries at Lachish in the spring and autumn of 1937; see provisionally the writer in the *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, December, 1937, pp. 23-24.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trace of monotheism worthy of the name except in Israel. Much more might be said in support of this rehabilitation of the monotheistic tradition. A great deal of ambiguity has been caused by certain scholars who insist on giving a unitarian definition of the term "monotheism," regardless of the fact that a definition which does not include the Orthodox Jewish, Catholic and trinitarian Protestant conceptions is highly misleading. Some of the Church Fathers, who considered the pagan deities as real devils, might equally well be refused the right to be called monotheists. It is singularly lacking in historical logic to insist that because we find undoubted indications of henotheism in the traditions of early Israel all Israelites must have been henotheists. The history of Yahwism (from *Yahweh*, a Hebrew name of God) in Israel, north and south, becomes unintelligible unless we accept the clear evidence of Israelite tradition. The history of religion in Israel was not a microcosmic reflection of the evolution of religion in world-history; it was just as homogeneous and as much an organic entity as the history of religion in Egypt, in Babylonia or in ancient Rome. Of course there was religious evolution between 1200 and 600 B.C. but it was comparable to the development of Christianity between 100 and 700 A.D. or to that of Islam between 700 and 1300 A.D.—not to that of Judaeo-Christianity between 300 B.C. and 300 A.D. (before and after the time of Christ) or of Brahmaro-Buddhism between 700 and 100 B.C. (before and after Gautama). In other words it was an evolution and not a mutation. There is not a hint in the prophetic anthologies of Amos or Hosea that there was anything novel about the teaching of monotheism; they were preachers and reformers, not religious innovators.

The last illustration is the nature of Mosaic law. The greatest achievement of Wellhausen was certainly his brilliant demonstration of the evolution of legal theory in the Book of the Covenant (Exodus 20-23—from the 9th century), Deuteronomy (7th century), Ezekiel (6th century) and the Priestly Code (6th or 5th century). That achievement will apparently

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

resist the impact of new evidence. But the fact that Israelite legal practice and theory were developing throughout the Monarchy does not in itself prove anything with regard to the antiquity of a given law or custom—not even when the latter appears in a relatively late source. The discovery in 1901-02 of the Code of Hammurabi, from the 19th century B.C., followed since the War by the publication of Hittite and Assyrian codes of laws from the 13th and the 12th centuries B. C., showed the improbability of Wellhausen's contention that law arose so late in Israel, especially since all of these codes, especially the oldest of them, show many points of contact with Mosaic law. In 1934 A. Alt of Leipzig, gathering together the evidence, showed conclusively that the casuistic laws in the Book of the Covenant (where the closest parallels to the codes are found) represent Canaanite influence on Israelite jurisprudence, whereas the Decalogue and other apodictic laws are authentically Hebrew and may well go back to Moses (though not necessarily in their present form).

Now that the writer has reasserted the antiquity of the Patriarchal tradition, has insisted on the Mosaic date of Israelite monotheism and has maintained the high age of most Pentateuchal legislation it may seem that he has returned to the conservative position of a century ago. Not at all. If the reader will turn back to the list of five main points in the program of the critical school, given above, he will note that the writer rejects numbers 2 and 3, but accepts numbers 1 and 4; number 5 he regards as partly right and partly wrong. His attitude toward the use of historico-critical method is the same as that of the great German school; he recognizes the same fallibility of oral tradition, of the official historian and of the ancient copyist. But the picture of Israel's history that he draws, from the Patriarchal Age to the Restoration, is curiously like the traditional one in essentials. Details may be altered, our new knowledge of the ancient world may shade the picture differently—but the broad outlines remain substantially the same.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dr. Rhine and the Mind's Eye

GARDNER MURPHY

IN EACH epoch of intellectual history the world becomes codified according to a consistent scheme. Instead of the welter of confusion and fleeting impressions which the naive senses convey to us we see patterns and order, rhythm and dependable recurrence. Though this is true of the world of Stoicism, the world of scholasticism, the world of humanism, it is true with a vengeance in relation to the world of mechanism. The combination of elementary mechanics and elementary mathematics presented by the great experimentalists has become more and more rigidly fixed as a world in which we must live. The progress of physics, mathematics and of late biology, has seemed to fill in detail and make more and more coherent a picture which is already easy to read in the *Leviathan* of Thomas Hobbes.

This simple mechanical structure has had to take, since the middle of the last century, many a blow from the hands of the physicists and astronomers, botanists and zoologists, but it has on the whole withstood the onslaught. The separate blows delivered independently have had but little cumulative effect. Psychology, youngest of the experimental sciences, has been content to model itself upon physics and biology and instead of challenging their tenets has felt that its own scientific status depended in large part upon acceptance of the standard world view.

This I think is the very simple and adequate reason for the hesitant reception which has been accorded experimental work upon processes of perception not conveyed to us along the ordinary path of the known senses. An experimental science, dealing with the process of perception, thought and voluntary action,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

might seem certain to afford a cordial greeting to any properly controlled laboratory investigation which would enlarge our knowledge of the nature of the process of perceiving or of the nervous system which mediates this process. Actually, however, when Sir William Barrett reported to the British Association in 1876 possible experimental evidence for thought transference he found as little response as had Dr. Elliotson 30 years earlier when demanding attention to the hypnotic trance. Helmholtz told Barrett quite simply that telepathy was not a question for evidence; he would not accept the evidence if he saw it with his own eyes since the thing was manifestly impossible. Not much more sophisticated in the scientific sense was the response to William James who from 1885 onward reported, with all the intensity and earnestness of which his spirit was capable, positive observations on the telepathic process.

The elaborate statistical surveys of spontaneous cases of psychic experiences made in England and the laboratory work done on the problem by the group to which Edmund Gurney belonged led within a few years to a somewhat more tolerant attitude in Great Britain than was true elsewhere. The *Encyclopædia Britannica*, for example, published systematic factual accounts of investigations in psychical research; and Andrew Lang's vivid portrayal of the situation did for the infant science what Huxley had done for Darwinism. On the whole, however, British science continued to view the matter askance, remarking, as C. D. Broad well put it, that there was a marked tendency to confuse the Author of Nature with the editor of *Nature*.

In the New World the rapid growth of spiritualism as a cult impaired rather than assisted the spread of systematic scientific inquiry. The American Society for Psychical Research gave most of its attention to the question of survival after death and university departments of psychology remained frankly uninterested in the entire field of psychical research. French and German psychology gave but little attention to the matter, one man in each of these countries taking up the investigation, pub-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lishing positive results and then withdrawing from the field, expressing uncertainty as to the meaning of his findings.

The only important exceptions are two experimental investigations of high merit done in the university laboratory: one at the University of Groningen in the Netherlands in 1921 by three members of the Department of Psychology at that institution; the other at Harvard by G. H. Estabrooks in 1925. The method used in the Groningen study was simple and practically ideal. Having found a subject, a student of dentistry, who seemed capable of perceiving by other than the usual means the experimenters asked him to sit in a cage in a room of the psychology laboratory, extending his arm through a slit on a level with his waist. Before him was a board marked off in 48 squares, eight rows by six. He was to move his hand back and forth until he felt that the square beneath his index finger was the one upon which the experimenters were concentrating their attention. The experimenters were in a room directly above that in which the subject sat. Drawing slips of paper from a bag to get a random distribution of numbers from 1 to 48 the three experimenters took turns in peering down through a hole which had been cut in the floor of their upper room, seeing the extended hand of the subject as it reached through the slit in his cage. On a chance basis there should be, during 187 experiments, about $\frac{187}{48}$ successes, or a total of about four. The actual number of successes was 60. Reference to Dr. Huntington's article in this number[1] will suggest the simplicity of the mathematical procedure for the study of such deviations above chance; but suffice it for this purpose to say that any such success as this would occur only once in many billions of experiments. Since the three experimenters were reputable members of the university's Department of Psychology and the senior experimenter, G. F. Heymans, is a man of international reputation the explanation of collusion need not, I think, detain us. The explanation which would be preferred by all psychologists is that of hyperesthesia of the known senses, notably sight

[1] "Is it Chance or ESP?" page 201.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and hearing. Regarding sight we have three facts to report: (1) the upper room was pitch-dark, the lower room illuminated; (2) the subject was blindfolded; (3) he was within a black cage which made the act of looking up at the hole in the ceiling impossible. Regarding auditory hyperesthesia (1) the experimenters found they could not make their voices carry to the lower room even when shouting; (2) they worked in total silence.

This experiment is practically unknown to psychologists the world over. I have for years called it to the attention of my friends and have rarely succeeded in getting anyone to read it. The statement, "We shall accept telepathy when there is evidence for it," is easily and naturally made; but one must remember that the evidence published in the technical journals of psychical research is not known to psychologists and that it is impossible to persuade them that there is anything there which is worthy of their attention. The data are *incompatible with the world view*; and it is psychology itself which has made clear to us why data incompatible with the world view not only fail of acceptance but fail even to hold the attention.

The Harvard study by Dr. Estabrooks made use of 83 subjects, most of them undergraduate students. They came, one at a time or in small groups, to a laboratory room or, rather, a double room, with a door separating the component parts. The experimenter, in one of these chambers, shuffled a complete deck of 52 playing cards, cut it with a knife, and concentrated upon the card on top. He went through this whole procedure over again for each of 21 trials for each subject. An electric click told the subject when it was time to call each card and record his guess. When scored for color and suit there was a marked tendency for subjects to start out very well. The successes were remarkably numerous at the *beginning* of the task—that is, in the first five calls for all the subjects lumped together. The second five calls for all subjects were not so good and by the end of the series the subjects had petered out until they were scoring only at a chance level for the last few calls. The entire

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mass of data for all calls is enormously beyond chance, a fact mostly due to the "beginner's luck" which most of the subjects enjoyed. This phenomenon of success at the beginning followed by a tapering off has persisted throughout the history of such investigations. Dr. Estabrook's method has been twice repeated under somewhat different conditions, once by himself, once by a colleague of his, with only chance results each time. This is a good reason for uncertainty as to the nature of the process at work but does not bear on the statistical question as to whether the first was a chance series, since it ought not to have given such results on a chance basis once in a century, though repeated monthly throughout that time.

Many brief or incomplete series, or series treated inadequately from a mathematical point of view, were published during the first period of this century. Some gave suggestions of positive, others of negative, results. To these we can hardly give space here.

Such was the situation when, in 1930, the Duke University experiments of J. B. Rhine began. Classroom efforts to secure subjects who could guess the contents of sealed envelopes were at first unsuccessful, as such efforts had been at Columbia and elsewhere. Several steps, however, were taken which radically altered the situation. In collaboration with his colleagues Dr. Rhine prepared five simple symbols (circle, cross, star, waves, rectangle) and determined that the subject's task should always be to guess which one of these five symbols appeared on a given card. Decks of cards were made up containing 25 in all—that is, five bearing each of the five symbols just mentioned. When the cards were shuffled and placed in a stack outside the range of any of the subject's senses he should be able, on a chance basis, to guess five of them right on the average. If the experimenter shuffled the cards without knowing how they stood at the end of the shuffling or if they were prepared by means of a mechanical shuffler the subject who could score consistently ahead of this chance expectation was called clairvoyant. If instead of aiming at the cards themselves the subject aimed at impressions

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the mind of a distant experimenter, deciding whether he was thinking of circle, cross etc. at a given moment, positive scores were labeled not clairvoyance but telepathy. If the experimenter was looking at the symbols which the subject was trying to guess and if the subject did succeed in getting them ahead of chance the results would be classified under "general extra-sensory perception"—that is, a form of extra-sensory perception in which either telepathy or clairvoyance or both might be involved.

A very simple formula was used by Dr. Rhine to compute the degree of likelihood, on a chance basis, of averaging 6 per 25, 7 per 25 etc. for various numbers of "runs," each run being 25 consecutive calls. As the reader will see from Dr. Huntington's article, a very slight correction has to be made in Dr. Rhine's mathematics but one so slight as to make no practical difference so far as scientific evaluation of the evidence is concerned.

The whole problem therefore is to determine whether there really are subjects who over considerable periods can maintain their success in scoring. Instead of the short series previously reported we have, in Dr. Rhine's case, the work of weeks, months or years, from each of a considerable number of subjects (one of whom, now working with me at Columbia, has made some million calls of her own). Now the extraordinary thing about the situation at Duke is that, as a result of circumstances which we shall try to analyze, eight subjects were soon found who could score remarkably ahead of chance, either at clairvoyance or at telepathy or at both, that others appeared later, and that more are appearing constantly both at Duke and at other university centers. We shall try then to describe, first, the essentials of the experimenter's program and, second, the interpretations which seem possible from a psychological point of view.

One of the chief methods employed by Dr. Rhine from 1930 to 1934 and relied on more and more since that time is the down-through, or D. T., procedure. The shuffled deck of 25

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or 50 or 100 cards is placed on a table, frequently out of sight of the subject, e.g. in another room or in another building. The subject calls in order from the first card to the last. In the "blind matching" procedure five key cards, one bearing each of the five symbols, are placed face down, generally either underneath opaque cover cards or behind a screen, while the subject holds an ordinary deck of 25 cards in his hands and places them, one at a time, opposite the key cards which he believes they match. If, for example, the card which he is taking off the top of the deck seems to him likely to be the same as the key card in the center of the group of five he puts it opposite that card and so proceeds with his five piles of cards. After a run of 25 the cards are checked for rightness or wrongness of matching. In "open matching" the key cards are placed face up; the subject who places a given card opposite the circle is indicating not simply that the two cards match (without knowing what they are) but is guessing that the card thus placed is one which bears a circle. In the matching techniques it is of course imperative (except in rough preliminary tests) either that the key cards be inaccessible to the senses or that each card within the hands of the subject be sealed in an opaque envelope. The latter method was, for example, used in a recent study with blind subjects at an institution in North Carolina, just to make assurance doubly sure, since in the case of all subjects hyperesthesia of the sense of touch must be taken into account along with all other known forms of hyperesthesia.

Naturally distance is the simplest way of taking care of the known senses. The series most emphasized by Dr. Rhine in his 1934 publication, *Extra-Sensory Perception*, was one done at a distance of some hundreds of yards in different buildings of the university, an independent experimenter and a subject reporting separately to Dr. Rhine and the two groups of cards—those actually used and those guessed—being compared. This long-distance series of clairvoyant guesses gave an anti-chance value of trillions to one.

Confirmatory evidence as to the reality of such extra-sensory

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

processes has now been obtained from investigators working at the University of Colorado, Fordham University, New York University, Hunter College, Columbia University, Tarkio College and from six other experimenters or groups of experimenters. The Hunter College series, for example, reports an average of 18.5 per 25 calls in the course of almost 2000 long distance calls.

But there is altogether too much of this work to be reviewed in a short article. The current investigations outside of Duke fall into two categories: those which merely repeat and confirm Dr. Rhine's original findings and those which go further into the dynamics of the processes involved. Since the reader is doubtless much more interested in the latter approach I shall attempt to summarize what has been done by Dr. Rhine or by others to discover the dynamics of extra-sensory perception.

In marked contrast to most of those who have worked in the field, Dr. Rhine has found that his subjects require no relaxation, dissociation or trance but can take an everyday objective attitude. The subject is trying to perceive something and goes about it as he would in any other case of perception. Subjects work fast; instead of giving introspective testimony they pay attention to the thing which is to be perceived. They call orally or they write down their guesses at rather high speed. Second, in the same vein, the assumption is made that bodily conditions which will facilitate perception in general will facilitate this kind of perception. They are accordingly given stimulants such as caffeine and benzedrine and the increase in their scoring ability is measured. In various long series they were given a depressing drug, sodium amytal, to pull their scores down to the chance level (that is, to destroy extra-sensory perception) and were then immediately given caffeine which pulled them up again to a high level.

Another main difference between Dr. Rhine's work and previous work lies in a study of the effect of varying the physical attributes of the material to be guessed. In a series at Tarkio College success on the ordinary symbols was compared with

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

success on "distorted symbols"—that is, circles, rectangles etc. so greatly distorted in shape as to be very different physically from the original although their general intended character was still clear. The distortion of the symbols did not in the least affect the capacity to perceive them correctly. Similarly in another series the symbols were printed in extremely large characters on some cards and on others were made so small as to be legible only with a reading glass. Small or large were perceived equally well. These are examples of a range of investigations that attempt to discover whether the laws generally accepted in relation to stimuli for ordinary perception apply also in extrasensory perception. While in the case of the drug experiment mentioned in the previous paragraph the results are what would be expected by the psychologist who knows something about the process of perceiving, the results on distorted symbols and on large and small symbols suggest that the physical properties of the stimuli may be less important than their functional meaning for the subject.

The third general finding, very plain in all the current work, is that success in this task depends in large part on the freshness and naïveté of the individual's approach. As we saw in the case of Dr. Estabrooks' work, many subjects start out high and in time move toward chance expectation. This has been misunderstood by some writers, who have thought that those who, among a large group, tend to score high at first will inevitably tend toward the mean chance expectation just as unusual runs of cards or dice will "iron themselves out." Both mathematically and experimentally there is a huge difference between the expected runs of luck and the high scores sustained by some *good* subjects over a period of months. The steady sustained efforts of the good subjects reported by Dr. Rhine have consistently given "anti-chance" values of billions or trillions to one, month after month for a considerable period, before the capacity fades out. Moreover it fades out according to a definite pattern and can sometimes by appropriate techniques be made to spurt forward again for a while. Such a finding is significant mainly for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the evidence it bears on the distinctive difference between training in some perceptual functions and training in extra-sensory perception. To train the subject here is not to keep him forever at the task but rather so to vary the task as to block the first phases of the tendency to go stale. Effort of the will is usually not effective. To determine that one will score high is much like the normal person's determination to go to sleep quickly. To get voluntary control of this vague, sensitive and complex process is far more difficult than it seems. One might, I think, fairly say that the chief weakness of all the Duke University work is that a method of training subjects has not been developed or even suggested.

One of the main concerns of the Duke laboratory at present is the comparison of various groups within the population—comparison in terms of many variables such as sex, mental capacity, physiological make-up etc. Although these studies are only beginning there is much interest in three groups of findings: (1) those reported by Mrs. Rhine, indicating very marked capacity among a group of children between 4 and 13—ability at least as high as that obtained in comparable groups of adults; (2) evidence of marked capacity among various handicapped groups, notably the blind, including nine totally blind subjects; (3) evidence for high-scoring capacities among some (but not all) psychotic groups at institutions. It seems likely that the natural history of the process can be understood from the point of view of comparative psychology. Often when the laboratory does not permit controlling all the important personal variables we may find that nature has given us groupings of individuals a comparison of which will give more decisive results.

Our position today can be summarized in a few words. We know very little more about extra-sensory perception than that it exists in some degree in many people and in a considerable degree in some people; that it is markedly affected by physical and mental conditions; that it is hard to train; and that it is not subject to the "will" as ordinarily conceived. Where, then, shall we go next? Different laboratories are investigating the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

problem in different ways but the following five questions are characteristic of current work. (1) What are the basic variables within the population—age, sex, intelligence, temperament etc.—which seem conducive to the display of such capacities? (2) What kinds of materials can best be perceived in this way? Shall we use diagrams, colors, tones, odors or what? (3) What are the best intellectual and emotional conditions of work—what aspects of the total activity of the organism facilitate this type of perceptual process? (4) How are these capacities related to physical time and space? Does the size, arrangement or distance of the object to be perceived make a difference and if so, how; and are we concerned only with the physical conditions at the moment of the experiment? (5) How are these obscure perceptual powers related to other activities of the total human personality? It is with problems such as these that university laboratories are now concerned and with reports along these lines that the *Journal of Parapsychology* is largely occupied.

In the psychological journals there have been several attacks upon Dr. Rhine's work, partly in terms of the mathematics and partly in terms of experimental control. The mathematical objections have uniformly dealt with minute points of detail which, even when sound, leave the psychologist confronted with the same problem. For the psychologist such questions are usually met better by empirical controls than by pure mathematical reasoning. The reply to mathematical objections which imply that Dr. Rhine is merely obtaining chance results is to run some hundreds of thousands of cards as empirical controls —that is for comparison, card by card, with other decks of cards. These empirical controls, now very voluminous, indicate, as of course they must, that where "chance" is at work the results agree with "chance expectations"—that is that on an "empirical chance basis" there are no results even in the same universe as those of the Duke experimenters. Regarding experimental control, the main objection has been that the cards are not absolutely opaque or that there are indications upon their

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

backs which might betray their character. It is exactly because of this last point that all the serious work emphasized by Dr. Rhine and his followers has been carried on with cards out of the reach of the senses. We find at one university an earnest psychologist trying to train his students to read the cards from the backs and proudly reporting that they can do well at the task; he believes this is an important and devastating result. The answer is that the fronts and backs of the cards belong experimentally in the same category; in the critical tests *neither* is seen. So far as serious evidence for extra-sensory perception is concerned the case rests upon procedures in which the whole card is entirely out of range of all the known senses.

One cannot avoid concluding in relation to these objections, which are at best relevant only to a small part of the total material, that the real basis for them lies in the facts mentioned in our opening paragraph. Ours is an age which has learned to see the world one way, and according to that one way there can be no such thing as perception without the senses. The learned world has been almost as gullible as the lay world whenever those great labor-saving devices, simple and complete cosmologies, have been offered. We dread confusion so profoundly that for the most part we cannot even see that which, as we say, makes no "sense." Indeed the evidence of our senses is not only our touchstone of reality; that which comes to us by other channels than the senses is, by the basic axiom of our being, "non-sense."

"Give me a place to stand," said Archimedes, "and I will move the world." The leverage for a replacement of 17th-century naive mechanism by other conceptions more characteristic of 20th-century scientific adventure is, I think, research on extra-sensory perception.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Is It Chance or ESP?

EDWARD V. HUNTINGTON

THE purpose of this paper is to state in non-technical language certain well-established mathematical facts about card-matching. It is hoped that these mathematical facts may be found useful in the current discussion of the validity of the Duke experiments on extra-sensory perception, but no opinion is expressed as to the actual validity of the experiments themselves. The "ESP" experiments which are being conducted by Dr. J. B. Rhine at Duke University and repeated by other investigators at other universities are the latest development in a long history of psychic research in which many leading scientists, especially in Europe, have not hesitated to participate.

What all these experiments if taken at their face value appear to show is that certain persons, at least at certain times, are able to obtain knowledge of external facts through channels other than the usual five senses—hence the name "extra-sensory perception." (For example in the Duke experiments a "good subject" appears to be able to "call" with astonishing correctness the symbols on a pack of ESP cards without looking at the cards.) The implications involved in the existence of such a power are clearly of startling importance for all our scientific and philosophical thinking and the discussion has become quite properly a matter of wide-spread public interest.

Dr. Rhine and his associates at Duke have gone further than any of their predecessors in the direction of placing such experiments on a quantitative basis. They have not only devised techniques by which the two species of extra-sensory perception, clairvoyance and telepathy, can be treated as separate phenomena but they have gone far toward lifting the whole problem out of the realm of isolated anecdotes (which, however well authenticated, cannot be readily repeated) and into

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the realm of quantitative observations conducted under laboratory conditions.

A central position in the whole discussion is occupied by the word "chance." If the observed results of the Duke experiments are no more than what would be expected to happen by "mere chance" then of course there is nothing to marvel at. If on the other hand the observed results cannot be accounted for on the basis of "mere chance" then they must either be accepted at their face value or else rejected on grounds which are purely psychological (that is, experimental) rather than mathematical. It is hoped that the present paper may help to clarify the mathematical meaning of the term "chance" as used in this connection.

Fortunately the relevant mathematical theorems can be *stated* in simple numerical terms, not requiring any knowledge of the "theory of probability" or of any "higher mathematics." The *proofs* of these theorems do indeed involve the use of rather formidable terms (like "standard deviation," "binomial distribution," "most probable value" etc.); but the *actual statement* of the theorems does not require any of this technical vocabulary and will be found to be entirely intelligible to the non-mathematical layman.

Before proceeding to the statement of these mathematical theorems I want to describe in brief outline a typical Duke experiment in order that the reader may see clearly what numerical measurements are involved. The "ESP" cards used at Duke, and now readily obtainable at book-stores, display five characteristic symbols: "square," "circle," "star," "plus," and "wave." A "pack" consists of 25 cards, five of each kind. The "operator" after shuffling the cards asks the "subject" to "call" them one after another through the pack as they are laid, face down, upon the table. The number of "hits" made in any "run" through the pack is called the "score" for that run. If the subject makes a high average score on a succession of runs he is said to possess a large measure of "ESP ability."

For example the "calls" recorded may be shown in the first

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

column of the accompanying table while the actual sequence of cards may be as shown in the second column. In this case the "score" is seen to be 8. Theoretically any score from 0 to 25 inclusive is possible. In this type of test, which we may call the "free calling test," the subject is under no obligation to call an equal number of each symbol. Thus in the illustration his "calls" include 6 waves and only 4 circles. Obviously a very high score cannot be secured unless the proportion is closely "5 each." On the other hand, if the subject calls any one symbol exclusively throughout the run his score will be exactly 5. In another type of test, which we may call the "matching test," the record in the column headed "calls" will always include 5 of each symbol.

"Calls"		*Actual Cards*
star		square
plus		star
star	=	star
circle		wave
square		plus
plus		star
circle	=	circle
wave	=	wave
wave		circle
plus		wave
star	=	star
square		star
square		circle
circle		plus
wave		circle
square	=	square
wave		plus
wave		square
wave	=	wave
plus	=	plus
circle		wave
plus		square
square	=	square
star		circle
star		plus

In either type of test the score most frequently observed is 5 and a subject whose score never rises much above 5 is judged to have no appreciable amount of "ESP ability." The question immediately arises: How much above 5 must the subject score to occasion any real astonishment? How high does the average score have to be to be regarded as significant of any real ability?

In order to formulate this question more precisely let us consider how many different actual "runs" with the ESP cards are possible—that is in how many distinct ways the second column in the table above may be written. This number of distinct "hands" is easily shown to be 623, 360, 743, 125, 120, which we may denote, for brevity, by the letter T. By a complete cycle of T runs we mean a theoretical cycle in which every possible "hand" will turn up just once without repetition.

Suppose now that a theoretical experiment of the "matching type" is considered, in which T operators are supposed to be laying down simultaneously T different packs of cards, each of the T packs being arranged in a different order. The subject

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

announces a single column of "calls." This column of calls is then compared with each of the T different columns of actual cards and the scores noted. Obviously the perfect score of 25 will occur only once since there is only one of the T actual hands which will exactly match the given column of calls. But a score like 5 or 8 or 10 will occur thousands of times since there will be thousands of hands which though differing among themselves will show the same number of "hits" when matched with the given calls.

TABLE I

Score	Relative frequency
0	.004 3
1	.025 5
2	.073 4
3	.136 6
4	.184 3
5	.191 9
6	.160 3
7	.110 1
8	.063 3
9	.030 9
10	.012 9
11	.004 7
12	.001 453
13	.000 394
14	.000 093
15	.000 019 143
16	.000 003 423
17	.000 000 531
18	.000 000 071 147
19	.000 000 008 247
20	.000 000 000 798
21	.000 000 000 070 786
22	.000 000 000 004 011
23	.000 000 000 000 401
24	.0
25	.000 000 000 000 001 6

The relative frequency with which any given score will occur in a complete cycle of T runs can be theoretically computed to any desired degree of precision. For example, it is known that the score of 21 will occur exactly 44,125 times in T runs—that is, the score of 21 will occur with a relative frequency of .000,000,000,070,8. Such high precision, however, is difficult to calculate and not needed in practice. A table which is accurate to at least three figures has been recently computed by Dr. T. E. Sterne, T. N. E. Greville and Bancroft H. Brown and is reproduced here as Table I. The meaning of this table is perfectly simple and definite. If we imagine a theoretically complete cycle of 623,360,743,125,120 distinct runs and match each of these against a fixed run called by the subject then, according to the table, the score of 5 will be observed about 19 per cent of the time, the score of 9 will be observed about 3 per cent of the time and so on. The score of 14 will occur only about once in 10,000 times, scores higher than 14 will occur less than once in 10,000 times—the very high scores occurring very much less frequently.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We note in passing that Table I was constructed with reference to the "matching type" of experiment. As to the "free calling" type it is known that the high scores will occur on the whole less frequently in the "free calling" cases than in the "matching type" cases. Consequently the table may be used with confidence in both cases, the error in the free calling case, if any, being in general on the safe side.

By rewriting part of Table I in a form showing "cumulative" frequencies we can answer another question which is perhaps the most natural question to ask in this connection. In a complete cycle of T runs in what proportion of cases will a score of say "8 or better" occur? Table II gives the answer: 0.114. In this table the value of P gives the proportion of times that any score of S or better will occur in a complete cycle of T runs. For example, a score of 12 or better will occur about twice in each 1000. If a subject scores above 14 on a single run he may be sure that less than one in 10,000 of all the possible scores in a complete cycle will rank higher than his.

TABLE II

Score S	Relative frequency of a score "S or better" P
5	.575
6	.383
7	.224
8	.114
9	.051
10	.020
11	.007
12	.002
13	.0005
14	.0001
15	.0000
..	.....

Next let us suppose that the subject goes through a sequence of runs, say 4, and let his "average score" for the sequence be obtained by taking his total score and dividing by 4. The number of distinct situations which must now be considered is no longer T but a number which we may represent for brevity by T^4—a huge number having 60 digits. A "complete cycle" of all possible situations in this case is represented by this number T^4. In this complete cycle an average score of 25 (which can be obtained only by making a perfect score of 25 on each of the four runs) will obviously occur just once. An average score of 7.25 or better, it is found, will occur in 13 cases per 1000. Other values are shown in Table III for $n = 4$. In this table the fraction P opposite any average score, S,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TABLE III

n = 4	
S	P
5.00	.538
5.50	.345
6.00	.193
6.50	.092
7.00	.038
7.50	.013
8.00	.004
8.25	.002
8.50	.001
9.00	.0002
9.25	.0001

n = 8	
S	P
5.00	.527
5.50	.268
6.00	.099
6.50	.026
6.75	.012
7.00	.005
7.25	.002
7.50	.001
7.87	.0001

n = 16	
S	P
5.00	.519
5.25	.330
5.50	.179
5.75	.081
6.00	.031
6.18	.013
6.25	.010
6.50	.003
6.56	.002
6.75	.006
7.00	.0001

n = 100	
S	P
5.00	.508
5.10	.319
5.20	.170
5.30	.075
5.40	.027
5.46	.014
5.50	.008
5.60	.002
5.70	.0004
5.77	.0001

shows the proportion of cases in a complete cycle of T^4 in which an average score of S or better will occur. The Tables for n = 8, n = 16 and n = 100 are to be understood in a similar sense. For example in the case n = 100 (in which the "complete cycle" is T^{100}) an average score of only 5.77 will be so rare that a better score will occur only once in 10,000 times.

Finally, by a simple modification of Table III we can construct another even more useful type of table known as a "rating table." In the instructions accompanying the published ESP cards Dr. Rhine includes a "rating table" giving for each value of n the total score which may be regarded as "good" or "very good" for that value. A slightly revised table of this sort is given below as Table IV. (Table IV is expressed in terms of average score instead of total score. The first line and the last column are supplementary material added by the present writer for convenience of reference.)[1] In this table "good" corresponds to a relative frequency of about .013, "very good" to about .002 and "extremely good" to about .0001. In other words "good" means about 1 in 75, "very good" about 1 in 500 and "extremely good" about 1 in 10,000. By a glance at

[1] For an account of the mathematical reasoning underlying the construction of Tables III and IV the reader may consult E. V. Huntington, "A Rating-Table for Card-Matching Problems," *Journal of Parapsychology* (Duke University), Vol. I, No. 4, December 1937 (published in January 1938).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a rating table of this sort we can tell at once, for any value of n, how high an average score will have to be to attain any desired level of rarity. For example if we are considering a sequence of 16 runs (n = 16) the average score will have to be as high as 6.56 before we can assert that a score as good or better than this will occur (in a complete cycle of T^{16} cases) with a frequency of less than once in 500 times. It will be noticed

TABLE IV

RATING TABLE FOR AVERAGE SCORES OBTAINED IN n RUNS

Number of runs n	Average score obtained in n runs		
	Good (1 in 75)	Very good (1 in 500)	Extremely good (1 in 10,000)
1	10.00	12.00	14.00
4	7.50	8.25	9.25
8	6.75	7.25	7.87
12	6.41	6.83	7.33
16	6.18	6.56	7.00
20	6.05	6.40	6.80
50	5.66	5.86	6.10
100	5.46	5.60	5.77

that the longer the sequence of runs the smaller the average score needs to be in order to rank as a rare occurrence. We note in passing that the numerical differences between this Table IV and the table supplied with the ESP cards are too small to be of any practical importance provided the experiments are of the "pure-matching" type. (In the "free calling" type the table may still be used with confidence, for the mean will still be 5, and since the dispersion about the mean is known to be less than in the pure matching case the error will be on the safe side.)

The tables presented above illustrate, in all its essential features, the type of information which mathematics as such is able to contribute to the investigation of the validity of the Duke

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

experiments. The mathematical facts cited, like all mathematical theorems, are of the "if . . . then" variety. *If* a complete cycle of runs—either T or T^n as the case may be—is presented *then* the relative frequency with which each score will occur is given exactly in the tables. There is no question of luck or chance involved in these statements; they represent mathematical facts. But in practice, of course, no complete cycle of runs in the sense defined above ever is presented. Only a small sample of a complete cycle is actually available in the laboratory. Of what value then are all these mathematical computations if they can never be applied except to an imaginary hypothetical case?

As a matter of fact mathematics tells only half the story in any investigation of this sort. Clear-cut mathematical facts must be supplemented by acts of judgment.

The first question on which the mathematical theory has to be supplemented by an act of judgment is the matter of the adequacy of the method used for shuffling the cards. Theoretically the cards are "perfectly shuffled" if in a complete cycle (as defined above) every possible hand appears just once. But of course in practice no complete cycle is ever observed and some element of judgment necessarily enters into any decision as to whether a given method of shuffling is to be accepted as satisfactory. Perhaps the simplest way to test the adequacy of a given method of shuffling is to apply the same method a large number of times under conditions precluding the operation of any ESP ability, seeing whether the resulting distribution of scores agrees well with the theoretical distribution which would be observed if we were able to examine a complete cycle of cases. If the agreement appears to be good the chosen method of shuffling may be judged satisfactory. Such tests have been made many times at Duke and the adequacy of the shuffling method used does not appear to have been challenged.

Another matter on which the mathematical theory must be supplemented by an act of judgment is the obvious and vital

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

question: How much importance should be attached to a high score? Thus, suppose we do observe an "extremely good" average score—that is one that would not be exceeded, in the theoretical cycle, once in 10,000 times. Shall we conclude from this that the event must have been caused by ESP ability because we can hardly suppose ourselves lucky enough to have stumbled upon an observation which is so rare? Or shall we conclude that the event was not caused by any special ability but was precisely one of those rare occurrences which would be bound to happen once in 10,000 times in the theoretical cycle?

Neither of these conclusions can be supported or refuted by any mathematical argument. Which conclusion we adopt must be decided on evidence of another type. As a matter of common sense, if the odds were 1 in 100,000, we should probably accept the first conclusion. If the odds were only 1 in 10 we should probably accept the second. Where shall we place the dividing line? The placing of this critical point—above which the observed results are to be regarded as "significant" (that is, sufficiently astonishing to warrant investigation of the cause) and below which they are to be regarded as not worthy of attention—the placing of this critical point requires an act of judgment, based on experience and common sense. The Duke experimenters have placed the critical point conservatively at about 1 in 150. This means that they regard as worthy of further study any subject whose average score is rarer than the odds of 1 to 150 would indicate. As a matter of fact many of their good subjects make average scores much above this level—many of them above the level of 1 in 10,000. (It should be emphasized in this connection that such a statement as "This average score is rarer than the odds of 1 to 10,000 would indicate" has reference always to a "complete cycle" of runs imagined as performed by the individual subject; it does not mean that in the population at large only one person in 10,000 has as much ESP ability as the subject who is being investigated. The Duke experiments are not concerned with the dis-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tribution of ESP ability in the population at large. Their figures apply only to the distribution of average scores recorded by individual subjects.) Whether the "level of significance" of 1 in 150 is a reasonable level for the Duke investigators to adopt is a matter of personal opinion. Certainly in many other fields of inquiry this level of 1 in 150 (that is, about 0.007) is accepted as significant. In the opinion of the present writer the investigators at Duke have been amply justified in regarding any subject who makes an average score of this degree of rarity as one well worthy of further investigation as to the possible cause of the phenomenon.

All attacks against the mathematics of the Duke experiments have affected only minor details and leave quite untouched the validity of the rating-table idea as typified by Table IV above. Burton H. Camp, president of the Institute of Mathematical Statistics, on December 30, 1937 issued the following statement:

> Dr. Rhine's investigations have two aspects; experimental and statistical. On the experimental side mathematicians of course have nothing to say. On the statistical side, however, recent mathematical work has established the fact that, assuming that the experiments have been properly performed, the statistical analysis is essentially valid. If the Rhine investigation is to be fairly attacked it must be on other than mathematical grounds.

If mathematics has successfully disposed of the hypothesis of chance what has psychology to say about the hypothesis of ESP?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Storm Center in Treaty-Making

HAROLD H. SPROUT

THE Constitution states that the President "shall have the power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." This division of power and function has provided an admirable mechanism for the protection of minority interests as well as for the expression and even promotion of antithetical conceptions of national interest and policy. It is the purpose of this paper to show how these phenomena have come to pass; to sketch briefly their effect, not only on the form and procedure of American diplomacy but also on the spirit and substance of American foreign policy; and to consider what if any revision of the treaty-making process is possible and desirable under existing conditions and circumstances.

Treaty-making under the Constitution involves four principal stages—negotiation, senatorial consent, ratification and exchange of ratifications. The Senate plays an occasional role in the first stage, a paramount role in the second, and none at all in the third and fourth.[1] The President has, in a few instances, sought the collective advice of the Senate before entering into treaty negotiations. He has sometimes placed Senators upon commissions appointed to negotiate treaties. He has frequently consulted with individual Senators prior to or during the course of negotiations. The trend of Senatorial opinion—in particular forewarnings of Senatorial opposition—may indirectly affect

[1] There is a popular tendency to confuse the second and third stages of treaty-making. Senatorial consent is a prerequisite to ratification but such consent does not itself constitute ratification. The President, not the Senate, ratifies treaties. Ratification is a formal act which, in conjunction with the exchange of ratifications with the other signatory or signatories, completes the process of treaty-making.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proceedings. But the Senate as a body has only rarely attempted to interfere with the process of negotiation. And its incursions into this realm have not been conspicuously successful. The Senate's great power over treaties lies rather in its veto on the completed work of the Executive. And it is chiefly this veto which, by producing the trends noted in the preceding paragraph, has become one of the storm centers of the Constitution.[2]

A draft treaty, on submission to the Senate for approval, is referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. This Committee has a broad discretion. It may, and sometimes does, hold public hearings at which interested parties state their views with fair assurance of publicity in at least the metropolitan newspapers. The Committee may then recommend unqualified ratification; it may draft amendments, possibly changing the whole purport of the treaty; it may propose reservations, limiting or even eliminating the obligations of the United States; it may bring in a report recommending rejection; or it may take no action at all.

When the Foreign Relations Committee has acted, the struggle, if there be one, is transferred to the floor of the Senate. Here the opposition can continue its assault by means of amendments, reservations and obstructionism in general. The Senate's rules facilitate such tactics. Although there is now a cumbersome procedure for limiting debate a determined Senatorial minority can still filibuster and otherwise delay final action almost indefinitely.

Consent to ratification with amendments or reservations causes further delay and complications. A draft treaty is in a sense a contract with the other signatory or signatories. It usually represents a compromise in which all parties have made concessions. The effect of Senatorial alterations is often to strike out concessions made by the United States while insisting on all concessions of the other signatories. Such alterations may thus defeat the whole undertaking and in addition engender resent-

[2] For the constitutional aspects of this question, one should consult Professor Edward S. Corwin's *President's Control of Foreign Relations* (1917), ch. 3; and Professor Quincy Wright's *Control of American Foreign Relations* (1922), ch. 14.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment and ill-will abroad. At the very least, amendments and reservations hold up ratification while the Executive strives to secure the consent of the other signatories. Negotiations to this end present difficulties enough when only one other Power is involved. Such difficulties become all but insuperable when it is necessary to secure the consent of a large number of Powers, as, for example, in the case of the Senate's qualified approval of the World Court Protocol in 1926.

Theoretically and mathematically the two-thirds requirement enables a comparatively small minority of Senators elected by an even smaller fraction of the country's population to defeat undertakings acceptable to an overwhelming majority of the American people. That the two-thirds rule has had such an effect on several occasions is probably beyond dispute. But this rule is not the only or even the principal source of minority obstructionism.[3] As already noted, the Senate's ordinary rules of procedure quite as much as the two-thirds rule offer large opportunities for obstructionism. A bare majority can incorporate amendments into a treaty or add reservations to a resolution of "advice and consent" to ratification. Such amendments or reservations may defeat the treaty's purpose even if they do not block final ratification. By skilfully utilizing the tricks and dodges of parliamentary procedure a determined minority can often delay a vote while it strives to mobilize support and can sometimes prevent the Senate from taking any action at all.

These various possibilities inherent in minority obstructionism, repeatedly stressed in criticisms of the Senate's treaty-veto,[4] pose a fundamental question of political science: Whether and to what extent governmental institutions should protect minority interests from the consequences of majority rule. One

[3] An important study, covering all treaties from 1789 to 1901, shows that the two-thirds rule did not produce results substantially different from what might have occurred under a simple majority rule. And the author of this study tentatively suggests, pending release of still unavailable source material, that this conclusion also holds, with but slight qualification, for the years since 1901. See R. E. McClendon, "The Two-Thirds Rule in Senate Action upon Treaties," in *American Journal of International Law* (1932), v. 26, pp. 37-56.

[4] For a representative sample of the large and growing critical literature on this question see Professor Frank D. Fleming's *Treaty Veto of the American Senate* (1930), *passim*, especially ch. 12.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the principal arguments for a judicial veto on legislation—one constantly reiterated in the recent Supreme Court controversy—rests upon the assumption that it is politically expedient as well as socially desirable to safeguard minority interests from the tyranny of the majority. And this same argument has been cited in justification of the Senate's veto on treaties.

As a matter of historical fact it is interesting to note that the Senate's treaty-veto was originally conceived largely with a view to protecting minority interests. In 1786 a bare majority of the States represented in the Continental Congress (the quasi-legislative body under the Articles of Confederation) carried a resolution, against solid Southern opposition, authorizing the Confederation's Foreign Secretary in return for a general commercial treaty with Spain to relinquish the rights of Americans to ship their merchandise down the Mississippi River through the Spanish port of New Orleans. On the other hand New Englanders were fearful lest the Central and Southern States should combine in a similar fashion to relinquish American claims against Great Britain respecting the Newfoundland fishing grounds. To prevent a sacrifice of one minority interest for the benefit of another, as well as for other reasons, the members of the Constitutional Convention of 1787 deemed it necessary to impose some check on the treaty-making power. And to prevent a bare majority from overriding an important minority it was finally decided to vest the power to make treaties in the President "with the advice and consent" of two-thirds of at least a Senatorial quorum.[5]

In practice the Senate's treaty-veto has protected minorities to an extent that the framers of the Constitution could scarcely have contemplated. Pressure by private interests held up one treaty for over 20 years. Treaties affecting the status or property rights of individuals have proved especially vulnerable. Treaties granting reciprocal tariff reductions have fared worst

[5] For further discussions of the origin of the Senate's treaty-veto one may well consult Charles Warren's *The Making of the Constitution* (1928), pp. 651-658; and R. E. McClendon's "Origin of the Two-Thirds Rule in Senate Action upon Treaties," in *American Historical Review* (1931), v. 36, pp. 768-772.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of all, the pressure of jeopardized minority interests having prevented affirmative action on nearly all reciprocity treaties submitted to the Senate.[6]

Such sensitivity to the pressure of interested groups—foreseen imperfectly if at all by the framers of the Constitution—is largely a product of the residential requirement and of our system of electioneering. The Constitution specifies that a Senator must be an "inhabitant of the State for which he shall be chosen." This requirement brings to the Senate men who are keenly aware of and normally sympathetic to important group interests within their respective States. Furthermore Senatorial candidates must ordinarily rely upon these interests to provide the large sums of money necessary to finance primary and election campaigns. They must also build up voting strength among the rank and file of the electorate. Under such conditions it is only common prudence for the ambitious politician to watch closely the currents of opinion and to heed the demands of influential pressure groups within his State. Thus whenever a pending treaty imperils local interests or otherwise agitates local opinion it is certain to arouse opposition in the Senate. And by complex bargaining, one phase of which is popularly known as "log-rolling," strong opposition by even one or two Senators may suffice to prevent affirmative action on a pending treaty.

Other developments, mostly unforeseen by the founding fathers, have also complicated the treaty-making process. The Senate in 1790 had 26 members; today it has 96. As the late George W. Wickersham once remarked: "A body of ninety-six men of such diverse characteristics and opinions," while "almost hopeless as an executive force . . . is ideal for purposes of obstruction."[7]

The rise of a bi-party system was another unforeseen development vitally affecting the treaty-making process. Political parties are pressure groups whose interests and activities affect foreign policy in various ways. Narrow partisanship has frequently

[6] For a detailed analysis of the fate of various kinds of treaties one should consult Professor R. J. Dangerfield's *In Defense of the Senate* (1933).

[7] "The Senate and Our Foreign Relations," in *Foreign Affairs* (1923), v. 2, pp. 177, 192.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

characterized the Senate's action on treaties as well as on domestic legislation. And the potentialities of such partisanship are obvious when it is remembered that the President's party ordinarily controls less than two-thirds and sometimes only a minority of the seats in the Senate.[8]

The group interest of the Senate itself has also affected treaty-making. A club atmosphere pervades the upper Chamber. To many of its members their position represents the fulfillment of a life-long ambition. A Senatorship is widely regarded as second only to the Presidency in prestige and renown. As a result the Senate collectively and Senators individually have developed a jealous concern for what they are pleased to call the Senate's prerogatives. One of the most jealously guarded of these prerogatives is the Senate's treaty-veto. And every attempt on the part of the Executive to coerce or to sidestep the Senate has stimulated the latter to assert its power, at whatever cost to the international prestige and influence of the nation as a whole.

This antagonism between Senate and Executive has received further impetus from a fundamental disagreement as to the basic aims and means of American foreign policy. American opinion has shown a marked tendency to cluster around the antithetical concepts of isolation and collective security. Those who incline toward the latter position generally feel that peace and prosperity for the United States is permanently achievable only in an orderly world and that the American people have therefore a real self-interest, not to mention a moral responsibility, in pledging their enormous power, in cooperation with other peace-loving nations, to prevent or if necessary to stop lawless aggression anywhere in the world. This view, toward which the executive branch of the Government has gravitated in recent years, stands in sharp contrast to the ancient American tradition of national security through neutrality, non-intervention and no entangling alliances. While there are various brands

[8] For an excellent study of the partisan basis of Senate action on treaties see Professor W. S. Holt's *Treaties Defeated by the Senate* (1933).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and degrees of isolationism those who incline toward this position generally feel that a policy of no pledges and little cooperation offers a larger assurance of peace and security—for the United States at least—than any scheme of collective action that can be operated in a world dominated by fear, suspicion, armed force, mass propaganda and mob psychology. The various brands of isolationist doctrine, always more popular in the interior than upon the seaboard, have long had vigorous champions in the Senate where the equal representation of States has resulted in over-representation of those less densely settled regions of the interior in which a narrow isolationism has traditionally had the greatest vogue.

This cleavage between the Executive and a large segment of Senatorial opinion dates from the closing years of the 19th century. In 1899 it found clear-cut expression in a Senatorial reservation to a convention for the pacific settlement of international disputes negotiated at the first Hague Conference. This formula, repeatedly used on subsequent occasions, states that "nothing contained in this convention shall be so construed as to require the United States . . . to depart from its traditional policy of not intruding upon, interfering with, or entangling itself in the political questions . . . of any foreign State; nor shall anything contained in the said convention be construed to imply a relinquishment . . . of its traditional attitude toward purely American questions."

This negative attitude toward political cooperation persisted down to the outbreak of the World War. There is abundant evidence of Senatorial antipathy to the internationalism of Secretary of State John Hay (1898-1905) and of President Theodore Roosevelt (1901-1909). And if this trend was less conspicuous thereafter it was largely because the Taft Administration (1909-1913) itself forsook the path of political cooperation with the Powers and once more sought security—for the United States—in a policy of isolation.

President Wilson's crusade for the League of Nations reopened the breach between Executive and Senate in a manner

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

calculated to give a continuing impetus to Senatorial isolationism. Without entering into the details of Wilson's tragic struggle for the League we may simply note two developments that were vitally to affect the exercise of the Senate's treaty-veto in the post-war years. The first was the famous propaganda campaign by which the anti-League forces reawakened, stimulated and gave a new lease of life to the traditional isolationism which was still deeply rooted in American ideology. The second was the notorious packing of the Foreign Relations Committee, reorganized after the congressional elections of 1918, with irreconcilable isolationists, whose influence continued into the twenties and is undoubtedly greater to this day than it might otherwise have been.

The resurgent isolationism of the country in general and of the Senate in particular has repeatedly affected treaty-making during the post-war years. The Senate qualified its approval of the Four Power Treaty of Washington (1921)[9] with a reservation which stated that the United States interpreted the treaty as involving "no commitment to armed force, no alliance, no obligation to join any defense." In 1926 the Senate consented to ratification of the Protocol of Adherence to the World Court with reservations which would have placed the United States in a favored position of irresponsibility enjoyed by no other member of that body. Two years later the Senatorial proceedings on the Pact of Paris revealed the isolationist forces still in the ascendency. In this instance only strong executive pressure coupled with an official interpretation that rendered the treaty all but worthless save as a moral gesture prevented the Senate from adopting formal amendments or reservations that might well have prevented the instrument from going into effect at all. Again, in the London Naval Conference of 1930, the practical certainty of Senatorial opposition may well have been a factor in President Hoover's refusal to enter

[9] This was the treaty, entered into at the Washington Arms Conference of 1921-1922, in which the Governments of Great Britain, Japan, France and the United States each renounced aggression against the others' insular dependencies in the Pacific and pledged mutual consultation in case of threatened aggression.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

into a "consultative pact" with the European Powers in return for greater armament concessions on the part of France. And finally, in 1935, isolationist sentiment in the Senate and in the country at large as well as poor management on the part of the Administration blocked the entry of the United States into the World Court on terms almost identical with those prescribed by the Senate itself back in 1926.

This episode precipitated a lively if short-lived agitation for a constitutional amendment to deprive Senatorial minorities of their power to thwart the Executive's diplomatic undertakings. Senator James P. Pope, a strong advocate of American entry into the League of Nations, proposed an amendment reducing the two-thirds requirement to a simple majority and there was fresh discussion of an earlier proposal to abolish the two-thirds rule in favor of a simple majority approval by both branches of Congress. These and other proposals, all calculated to enlarge the President's control over foreign policy, raise several fundamental questions: First, whether the suggested constitutional amendments would really effect the reform which their sponsors desire; second, whether any constitutional amendment to this end is politically possible; third, whether it is needed; and fourth, whether any revision of the treaty-making process is really desirable.

With respect to the first question it is not clear that a mere substitution of majority rule would afford the relief which the Senate's critics desire. Such a reform would not eliminate the obstructive potentialities inherent in the discretion of the Foreign Relations Committee and in the ordinary rules of Senate procedure. Minorities could still urge amendments and reservations, bargain with their colleagues for support, filibuster and otherwise obstruct progress. A simple majority rule would admittedly place treaties in as favorable a situation as ordinary legislative proposals. But would that be sufficient? In dealing with the latter the Senate and House are framing as well as endorsing policy. In dealing with treaties, on the contrary, the legislative body is passing on a completed instrument, con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tractual in character, alteration as well as rejection of which may well defeat the whole undertaking. It is therefore arguable that to make the treaty-process a really effective instrument of a positive foreign policy it would be virtually necessary to abolish legislative review of treaties altogether.

Coming to the second question it is clear that any constitutional revision of the treaty-making process lies beyond the horizon of practical politics. The amending process is notoriously difficult under the most favorable conditions. But conditions here are decidedly unfavorable. And it is likely that they will remain so, so long as Senators jealously guard the prestige and prerogatives of the upper Chamber; so long as so many influential pressure groups can derive advantage from the existing treaty-veto; and so long as there remains a basic cleavage in American thought as to the national interest and destiny of the United States.

Turning to the third question it is at least arguable that no constitutional revision of the treaty-making process is really necessary. To avoid the Senate's veto, statesmen have utilized other vehicles for national policies. One of these is the informal executive agreement. The Protocol of 1901, arranging for payment of the Boxer Indemnity, was never submitted to the Senate. In 1907 President Theodore Roosevelt entered into an executive agreement with Japan for limiting emigration to the United States. An informal executive agreement, however, has certain weaknesses and limitations. It has no legal standing and imposes no more than a political or moral obligation even upon the Administration that makes it.

To meet this deficiency, statesman have evolved another type of instrument which within a limited field offers virtually all the advantages of a formal treaty but without the necessity of Senatorial consent to ratification. Congress may authorize the President to enter into executive agreements with respect to matters falling within its constitutional powers. Such agreements have the force of law and are constitutional provided Congress has prescribed certain general principles to which the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

agreements must conform. The Trade Agreements, under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, illustrate this type of procedure. Every one of these Agreements embodies tariff concessions that would never receive a simple majority endorsement in Congress to say nothing of a two-thirds vote of approval in the Senate.

The congressional joint resolution offers still a third substitute for the treaty-process. The expansionists of 1844 could not muster the two-thirds necessary to perfect a treaty for the annexation of Texas. The expansionists of 1898 found themselves in the same predicament with regard to a treaty for the annexation of Hawaii. In each instance the constitutional difficulty was sidestepped by resort to a joint resolution which required only simple majorities in each chamber and was just as much a law of the land as any treaty. This procedure has been utilized recently to effect the entry of the United States into the International Labor Organization. And it is currently advocated as a constitutional avenue for the entry of the United States into both the World Court and the League of Nations.

Considering the latitude of action possible under these three procedures one might perhaps conclude that there is no urgent reason for attempting to simplify the treaty-making power by the difficult process of constitutional amendment. Such a conclusion, which in general seems well-founded, does not, however, foreclose discussion of the final question: Whether it is even theoretically desirable to curtail or to abolish the treaty-veto of the Senate.

There can be no dogmatic answer to this question. Each person's answer will probably depend largely upon his preference as to the brand of foreign policy the United States should follow. As already noted there are many today who believe (with the Roosevelt Administration) that national self-interest, if not moral obligation as well, demands a positive foreign policy, and that the American people should cast their lot with the great European democracies to enforce a régime of peace and collective security. Persons strongly inclined toward such a posi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion may feel that everything possible should be done to strengthen the President's power over foreign policy and to avoid the obstructionism that so often paralyzes Senate proceedings on treaties.

On the other hand there are many who have doubts as to the advantages of a positive foreign policy; who still feel that, for the United States, a conservative policy of no commitments and little cooperation presents fewer perils in a world dominated by fear, suspicion, armed force, mass propaganda and mob psychology; and who question in any case the wisdom of large commitments so long as the nation remains hopelessly divided respecting the basic aims and methods of national policy. Persons entertaining such doubts will certainly regard the congressional majorities necessary to authorize international commitments under joint resolution or by executive agreement as a wise restraint on the Executive's capacity to pledge the United States to act in concert with other Powers. And such persons may even view the Senate's existing treaty-veto, with all its admitted imperfections and opportunities for minority obstruction, as an anchor to windward from which we should not lightly cut ourselves adrift.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Spiritual Dualism and Daily Bread

NICHOLAS BERDYAEV

Translated by DONALD A. LOWRIE

THERE is much talk these days, especially in France, of neo-humanism. Everyone, from Catholic Thomists to communists, seems to want to be a neo-humanist. This is probably a natural reaction to the process of de-humanization which we see at work in every part of the world and especially noticeably in fascism. And the fact that communists are striving to develop their own, Marxist, humanism is doubtless evidence of a crisis in communist ideology. Lenin was not at all a humanist. Fascist ideology consciously strives to be anti-humanist. In the case of communism the situation is more complex. It seems to me that at the present time Hitler is exercising a large and useful influence on Russian communism. Since communists do not want to resemble Hitler and are ashamed of such resemblance they are forced to change their direction and begin to take into consideration a problem they have hitherto completely ignored—the problem of man.

Hitler, of course, is not the only reason for this change. The neo-humanist movement brings sharply to the fore the problem of relationship between the social revolution and spiritual values. Is it true that the social revolution must deny spiritual values, or at best limit the sphere of action and lower the level of spiritual culture? This is what took place in the Russian revolution but does that prove that this must always happen, as some of the social revolutionaries together with some defenders of the things of the spirit now affirm? The answer is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not a matter of one or another form of social organization: it depends upon how you understand man. In principle it is quite possible to live in a communistic social organization and at the same time understand man and his calling in a fashion radically different from that of the communists. In practice this is less simple. There is a fundamental relationship between a social movement striving for a new and more just social order on the one hand and on the other a movement to confirm the eternal values of the spirit, a movement which thinks of man not only as a social but also as a spiritual being. The fate of humanity hangs on the answer to this question.

The defense of spiritual values has often been put to repulsive uses. It has been used to defend injustice, human degradation and slavery, the privileges of the ruling classes. And this has produced a natural reaction against the very idea of spiritual values. Marx's hatred of religion is to a large extent hatred of the falsehoods he saw associated with religion. Marx never speaks of religion as such: he speaks only of the negative social use of religion for selfish ends. Nothing better demonstrates the limitations of a man like Marx, scarred by social evil, than the fact that this is all he could perceive in the religious problem. This raises the question of Marxist humanism and its fundamental contradictions.

The publication of Marx's *Nachlass* and a study of his early ideas clearly prove the humanistic sources of Marxism. From the philosophical point of view the young Marx is much more interesting than the older man. His basic idea, out of which he developed the whole of his illuminating criticism of capitalism, was that of the impoverishment of human nature in a capitalistic economy. The proletarianization of man involves not only taking from him the product of his labor but the integrity of his nature as well. Human nature is divided into parts. Human activity, human labor, is presented as something outside man, an objective reality on which man is completely dependent. Economics are held to be subject to laws just as definite and final as those that govern the material world. These laws have

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been used to justify injustice and exploitation. This separation of man from his labor, his activity, gives rise to a whole series of false ideological concepts. Marx shattered the congealing categories of bourgeois economics. He saw human labor and conflict as the one prime reality of social life. Bound up with this is his remarkable idea of the fetishism of goods. The old interpretation of Marxism as logical and extreme determinism is wrong. Economic determinism is more truly a quality of bourgeois economics. There is nothing fatalistic in Marxism: his is a very realistic philosophy, that of conflict. And this philosophy cannot be called materialism, for materialism is passive and determinist. Even Marx's personal materialism is very doubtful—it is less truly materialistic than an attitude of conflict against the old idealism. At all events Marx lays great emphasis on the activity of the subject. And his revolutionary ideas have no connection with a world-view wherein everything is defined by objects and objective processes.

The young Marx carried over into the sphere of social life Feuerbach's idea of religious belief as impoverishing human nature. Marx demands that the fulness and integrity of man's personality be restored to him. He is a deadly enemy of capitalism because capitalism makes the laborer a thing, an object of barter and sale. This is the humanism of Marx. He proclaims revolution against the capitalist world in the name of man's rights, man's fullest life. And in this revolution the proletariat is to play a special role because it has been specially robbed, has suffered special deprivation. The proletarian's complete poverty, the thorough impoverishment of his human nature, is to be dialectically transformed into the greatest wealth, into fulness of humanity. These are the first sources of Marxist humanism. Marx demands that everything be totalitarian. Totalitarianism is true revolutionism—as Lukacs, the wisest of communist authors, demonstrates. This is a totalitarian world-view demanding conflict with all defenders of the spirit and of spiritual values. And it is this attitude that presents the greatest obstacle to many liberals who, in complete agreement with

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Marxism on practical social questions, might consider joining the Marxist communists.

Just what was Marx's idea of man—what was his type of anthropology? As a matter of fact Marx never really faced the problem in its fulness: he was interested only in man's social projection. He considered man as an exclusively social being, completely determined by society. To the Marxist, man is terribly active in society but he has no inner life; he remains a being of two dimensions; he lacks all depth. In his concept of man Marx is a thorough determinist: where he gets man's extraordinary activity and his capacity for heroic conflict is quite inexplicable. In man there is no higher nature, no spiritual element that could help him rise above the world about him. In Marx as in Feuerbach man still lacks an integral human nature—that is, a human nature "lacking nothing of completeness." Man has been robbed of his human nature, but even in a communist society it is not regained: man continues to be a material being with no admixture of the spiritual. The idea of personality is lacking in Marxism. Marx formed his idea of man at the moment of his own greatest deprivation when he had been robbed of all higher values. Even art and science, which Marxian communists of course recognize and accord a place in their system of values, do not imply a recognition of spiritual elements in man since they are thought of as accessories to the process of production. This is a basic contradiction in Marxist humanism. And the process of depriving man of his spiritual nature goes on in Marxism just as in capitalism.

In my opinion the main indictment for this error is not to be drawn against Marxists and communists. Rather, the greater blame rests on those who have attempted to defend spiritual values—on Christians. Whenever the bearers and protectors of spiritual values have stood for an alienation of their human nature from the laboring masses, thinking thereby to support the spiritual values of a privileged minority, they have been preparing that complete denial of the spiritual which accompanies a social revolution. Whenever Christians have defended the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ruling classes as necessary to the preservation of the existing order they have facilitated the many mass-attacks on Christianity and its complete rejection. A gulf has been fixed between the social and the spiritual movements in the world. What a monstrous error was perpetrated by Christians in admitting a distinction between man's individual and his social acts! Although Christianity has insisted that man's individual acts should be in accord with the teaching of Christ, his actions in the social sphere have been permitted to follow rules and norms that have nothing whatever to do with the Gospels or with Christ's commandments. In his social action a Christian has been allowed to be a political tyrant or, in the economic sphere, an exploiter.

This hypocritical dualism has brought Christianity as a whole under suspicion. On the other hand the cultural élite, who considered themselves the creators and defenders of spiritual values, have set themselves aristocratically apart from social life and from the masses and have lost their zeal for social service, their sense of prophetic mission in word and thought. The élite have refrained from saying their word in defense of social justice. Human nature has been torn apart, its integrity lost. A civilization built on this sharp dualism of spirit and body, mental and physical labor, has now exhausted itself and must be replaced.

But the social revolution, no matter how justified, cannot of itself return to man these stolen values because it does not face the fundamental problem of human personality. Christian piety has always looked into the depths of man's soul but it has had a mistaken attitude toward social life. True religious feeling should have concerned itself with the transfiguration of social life, the relation of man to man in the human unit "we." And we may look for the reintegration of human nature, the attainment of abundance of life, an integral humanism, only after a new meeting of the spiritual with the social. Any sort of neo-humanism is impossible until man is recognized as a spiritual being, a personality, the creator of spiritual values.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Again, the scorn and neglect evidenced by men of the spirit for the human body and its needs, their indifference to the problem of daily bread, have been grave errors bringing their own just recompense in their wake. For daily bread is a spiritual problem and one that gives socialism a religious implication. Man is a totalitarian being in whom three elements are joined—body, mind, and spirit. No one of these may be subtracted from the whole. Nothing that attempts this division can be called humanism. For what I consider humanism is not the affirmation of man's self-sufficiency (the basic error in the old humanism) but the affirmation of man's intrinsic worth together with insistence upon an abundant life for him.

The humanism of the past was based upon the recognition of the universal elements in human nature, the universal in man's mental and moral constitution. This recognition is part of our heritage from Greece. Marxism introduces an essential change into the humanist consciousness. The "class-conscious" point of view shatters the unity and the universality of human nature. Bourgeois thought and proletarian thought, bourgeois and proletarian morals, are presented as something quite different from, and hostile to, each other. As a matter of fact Marxism is mainly right in this affirmation. Even if there is no such thing as class truth or class falsehood, class distortion of the truth does exist. This distortion, as a social influence, has extended even to theology, so that dogmas have sometimes been interpreted in ways that reflect the authority of the ruling classes. Social and psychological attitudes may be more or less favorable to the discovery of truth and justice. Universalism is not automatically effective in human processes of thought. The old humanism was based upon the universality of man's mental nature. But true humanism must be grounded, not upon man's reason but upon his integral spirit.

And this integrality of spirit must be comprehended dynamically. The supreme evil in all modern totalitarian states and societies is their failure to grasp the truth that only man himself can be totalitarian, that man belongs not to one but to two

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

planes of being, the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Caesar. I use the word "totalitarian" to define a state which controls and organizes the whole of human life—not merely its political and economic phases but man's spiritual and intellectual life as well. The totalitarian state tries to subject the entire human personality to itself, to exercise authority over the souls of men. It demands that its subjects confess the particular world-philosophy which the state recognizes as the only true one. Hence a totalitarian state denies freedom of conscience and comes into conflict with Christian beliefs. Present-day fascist and communist states are both totalitarian, with this difference between them: that communism considers the totalitarian state a temporary and passing condition whereas fascism considers it normal and permanent. Any state or society must be only partial. Man has a value above all these others, above the state, the nation, society. Only God Himself is higher than man. This is real humanism.

Therefore the social question is also a spiritual question, the problem of man's destiny and the fate of an integral humanity. This integral human nature postulates spiritual values and a spiritual life independent of the social milieu. But it would be a mistake to strive for a more abundant life for man while neglecting his social aspect and the conflict for social justice. Even in this conflict the spiritual is an essential element. And men of the spiritual life today cannot avoid taking sides in the battle: they must take upon themselves the responsibility for the fate of man. Here, of course, only one choice is possible. The spiritually-minded of our day must fight on the side of liberty and justice and mercy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Surrealism—Or The Reason for Unreason

JEAN CHARLOT

"Le premier qui vit un chameau
S'enfuit à cet objet nouveau"

WITH the lapse of time events puzzling in their day have a way of falling into line so that the most madcap and "unpredictable" ones will eventually, like good soldiers, goose-step with their more sedate colleagues along the orderly paths of history. The accident or fancy of yesterday is labeled and neatly shelved as quickly as a new present is begotten. Those tempted to resent the advent of surrealism as a jog to their established routine, instead of concentrating on the strangeness of the new-born might well be thankful for the way in which, simply by being, it heaped and bound together the diverse personalities and tendencies of yesterday into a coherent whole. We can refer now to this thing of the past, the art style of the first third of the 20th century, with the same pedagogical clarity with which we speak of a school of 18th century painting. Such generalizations are bound to falsify but come within the historian's right. It may become history that modern art up to 1930 partook of those sturdy common sense qualities, this squatty code of ethics which took the name of cubism.

The main creed of cubism was a belief in the existence of the picture as such, its autonomous right to live independent of its subject matter in the same way, contemporary critics would point out, that a cow does not have to look like a tree to claim a right to existence. Paint was to be appreciated as pigment, the canvas was no longer the open window of impressionism but hemp or linen, woven and primed; the stretcher itself with its four square angles and the geometric relation of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its sides commanded the inter-relation of lines and colors that were to come into being, bound within its rectangle. Cubist painters liked to think of themselves as craftsmen whose job it was to construct out of this wood, canvas and pigments some objects called paintings, not illusive visions but possessed of a reality like that of a chair or a table; this painter-craftsman, as craftsmen will, took to soliloquizing about tools, permanency, recipes; mastering the craft of painting came to depend on technique, the respective merits of thick or thin layers, the memorizing of geometric formulas such as the "golden section." The cubist sighing for an era wherein the guild member willed to his apprentice a set of fixed rules to work by, attempted by a cool analysis of the works of the past to recover those mathematical recipes and technical turns which he believed to be synonymous with greatness. What the painter had a right to assume as craftsman was elaborated upon, swallowed bait, hook and line by the critics who in turn educated their public into this religion of art from the maker's point of view—one of fetichism in all that concerns the physical body of paint, textures that the finger can verify, proportions that a tape-measure will fathom.

The poor layman who through the centuries had appreciated pictures in terms of landscapes, seascapes, still-lives and portraits had those switched from under his nose by the cubist critic and was instead given, as object for his love, anonymous rectangles dressed in a harlequin's coat of lines and colors. At first irked by this meager fare, the public later became elated by the assumed knowledge that they were no longer mere laymen but shared the artist's most esoteric point of view. A reference to subject-matter came to be shunned as a plebeian faux-pas. A Burial of Christ by Titian, apples by Cézanne, were judged identical because they contained similar arrangements of circles and angles. It is true that a residue of subject-matter still lingered, a battered guitar or a melted bottle, but imprisoned solidly behind the cross-bars of the "abstract" design; even emotional response to line and the dramatic sugges-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions of color were stifled; man was allowed to react to paint in a muscular way only, as a bull does to red.

This very excess made the job of the younger men easier, gave a good platform to the reaction. Young enthusiasts found it easy to laugh at the older cubist whose eye remained glued to lines, angles and colors with the narcissist attention of the fakir for his navel. Their elders were wrong after all when they decreed that a picture was an object and a painter a craftsman. For of what use would be the physical body of paint if not as a spring-board for this most noble and by now almost forgotten ingredient of art called inspiration, this metaphysical spring without which the art object could not tick. To this wealth of correlations, emotions, moods that their elders had denied, the surrealists would give free rein. An inspiration or dæmon, the wind of whose passage had materialized a century before in the embattled wig of the bohème, would take hold of them anew. The great *leit-motive* of the romantics, life, death and love, were to be unleashed, but brought up to date within the scientific tenets of Freudian terminology: those eternal themes were now "complexes" with Greek aliases full of Germanic implications. Unlike the sibyl of old through whom the gods spoke, and unlike the artist of yesteryear whom passion swayed, the surrealist was to be dominated by his subconscious. His picture was to be a stage on which this nether world would perform.

In practice this meant that after a lapse of some 60 years during which the art-for-art slogan reigned, painting was to come back to its old purpose of telling stories. The public was by now fed up with sharing the personal failures and victories of the painter struggling within the intricacies of his craft, and sighed with relief when addressed by the painter of anecdotes who faced his public squarely, catered to the layman in his own language.

The return to subject-matter is both vital and healthy. That pigment and canvas should be transformed into sunlight, moonlight, relatives or grazing cows is magical to the utmost. That

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

such an amazing fact had been taken for granted by generations of innocent-minded onlookers had dulled this truth to the point where critics of the cubist generation tabooed enjoyment of subject-matter as a show of childish ignorance. It became the surrealist's easy lot to exalt representation as being art's most magical function. That painters and critics found themselves, in so doing, singing from the same pew as all the academicians of the past did not dim their enthusiasm, for such oldsters as Meissonier and Gérôme, careful and horrid painters that they are, had been forgotten for so long and their works hidden with such shame that their rediscovery held a thrill of newness like the discovery of a Grünewald or a Greco.

Most of us have seen, in our youth or at public auctions, some of those obsolete pictures smoothly finished and entirely credible, of brightly uniformed soldiers galloping heroically to their death at a lusty shout of "Vive Napoléon!" or of pink and red cardinals at a table, or (as in the case of our own G. J. Brown) of well-washed bootblacks emoting prettily. Dissimilar as their subject may be from the pictures of a Dali, a close bond links them together. Both Meissonier and Dali paint to bring forth their subject-matter and both, through a desire to make their anecdote convincing, came to adopt this same patient style, known as photographic, which attempts to be no style at all and is eminently suited to story-telling. It is strange to realize that for generations laymen approved of it as the only reasonable way to paint. It was considered a show of common sense that Meissonier in his great thirst for objective rendering would pour, one spring, sugar by the ton on the fields of Poissy to transform them into the Russian steppes needed for his picture of the retreat from Moscow. His great renown enabled him to borrow from the Musée des Invalides the original redingote of the Emperor. On the roof of his studio he would wear it himself, climb astride a saddle propped on a carpenter's horse and, facing a mirror, carefully duplicate, palette in hand and in a storm real this time, the snow-flakes melting on the august relic. Dali copying a lamb chop perched on his

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wife's shoulder illustrates, on a pettier scale, the same love of objectivity by which man, trying to impose commonplace rendering on art, can attempt it only through uncommon antics.

The surrealist's comeback to an academic technique shows that he understands his job as a story-teller. Before him Boecklin, having selected disturbing imageries for his theme, chose also to work them out in cold blood. The more improbable the subject-matter the more impressive will be its photographic rendering, a trick already well worn out by ghost-story writers. But this problem of anecdote painting, which now faces the surrealist as it used to face the academician, involves more problems than the choice of the correct story and the correct model. A small-scale and patient rendering, quaint boxed frames with glass and plush, are successful inasmuch as they make the surrealist picture secede from the corporeal appearance of the large-scale, broadly-brushed painting that preceded it, but it sidesteps the main issue. Painting is primarily a visual art. Lines, angles, and colors are the tools with which the painter plies his trade; their qualities, affinities and oppositions are the grammar of his language. It was not laziness or lack of imagination that made Vermeer confine himself for a lifetime of study to a table, a curtain, a window and a bare wall. Rembrandt had his fill with what he saw in his shaving glass. Cézanne's life was not long enough to round an apple or erect the cylinder of a bottle. What comprehensive geniuses then would be Meissonier and Dali who far transcend the subject-matter of these masters and pour onto their canvas armies of galloping hussars or 38 bicycle riders to a three-inch square!

It is the superficial approach of such painters to objective nature which allows them to commit such involved feats. Their confusion of the natural spectacle with the endless chromos and snapshots that have molded their vision is a protective armor permitting them to deal with visual art and yet never to question their ready-made reflexes, never to deepen their knowledge of optics. Their idiom gives us the glyph or pictured idea of an object but not its weight, its texture, its relation to the world, its

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spiritual implications. They may write in paint the detailed memorandum of a plot, but the drama itself will stir us only through the language of true painting. A revelation of the problem that plagues the born painter would result in the case of those voluble story-tellers in immediate impotency. It is indeed consistent with our human limitations in other fields of research that to give the essence of things the true painter has to busy himself with few and very simple objects. Yet his is less of a failure than that of the academic painter who, though able to complete in paint an ambitious diorama, misses the inner life of his subject, gives us less than the man who recreates an apple.

In his own words the surrealist is pledged to the conquest of the irrational. This claim, by opposing the cult of the well-ordered and of the functional which marks the achievements of the 20's, is a slap to the faith of the preceding generation; and though this may not be the reason for his stand the young surrealist would be inhuman who did not enjoy the deed. His own excess in genuflecting to unreason is partly explained by the bigotry of his opponent. The idolatrous attitude towards the machine sacrificed much that was licit when it heralded the dictatorship of the streamline, this heartless rejection of all gadgets that have no discernible purpose. The modern engineer had claimed nature as his own, pointing to the mathematical precision of the curve, the clinical whiteness of an egg. It is easy to contradict his claim, for even if a progressive bird could hatch her brood in a china bowl, the array of twiglets, straw, leaf, rags and mud with which he upholsters the nest would give her young a more proprietary satisfaction, a more mimetic contact with their own motley bodies. The smooth and streamlined egg of the engineer is after all only a device to bring forth a chick as stuffy with feathers as a quilt of the antimacassar days. Mother Nature may be at times partner to the purist mood of a modern house by Le Corbusier, but will lapse at others into the Victorian. Our body, which like the egg and the house happens also to be a "machine à habiter,"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seldom uses the ruled line, the right angle, and the flat planes associated with the term "functional." The earth itself carefully clothes its mineral skeleton with blades of grass, the flutter of foliage and the mist of dew. In this sense the Albert Memorial is nearer to natural processes than a skyscraper. A surrealist picture that despises the cubist rules of surface and color composition acquires also, as a jungle will, a complicated and amorphous character, the kind of new baroque which, like the baroque of old, reclaims line and color from the too rational government of the ruler, the compass and Chevreul's rotating disc. Even the unusual subject-matter indulged in by surrealists is not irrationally chosen, for they gather to their bosom the useless things despised by their predecessors, thrown by their cruel logic on the ash-heap: a pitiful assortment of fragments—of broken watches, dead organs, crumbled pianos; of what has outlived its function; of what repels and of what stinks.

That painting is a possible vehicle for the subconscious has long been acknowledged by the Chinese who cherish historical samples of brush writing for psychological reasons unrelated to calligraphy or literary content. For the same spiritual purpose we treasure the representation of common objects in paint if they show the hand of a master. One can make use of an indifferent subject-matter to release instinctive drama and lyricism through the passionate automatism of the brush stroke; but there is incompatibility between a mechanical rendering and the free play of the subconscious. It is strange that the surrealist who stores up as treasures bits of automatic writing, words uttered in a trance, remembered fragments of dream, does not believe in the subjective virtues of direct painting. His roundabout way of using paint by taming his muscular action within the intricacies of technique kills the subconscious impulses before they reach the hand.

Painters do not have the reputation of being intellectuals, nor is it their business to be such. Rarely original thinkers, they are however sufficiently sensitized to mirror the current thought of the day. But they need, if they are to be painters at all, to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

preserve a positive belief in their craft and in the world. Monet, imbued with the materialistic science of his time, shunned mythology in his landscapes but by humbling man's moods before the moods of nature he drank from the very source from which pantheism is born. Picasso, counselled by the Bergsonian quest of his own day, ripped guitars and Greek statues to unrecognition, but his zest with paint nevertheless brings forth a chaotic matter which contains, as do our very body's viscera, the disorder but also the juices of life. It may be that the Freudian analogies on which Dali props his work contain too much magic to admit of a magic handling; in this case he is less well served by his time's current thought than were his predecessors, a congenital defect which may wreck the new movement at birth. An act of simple faith remains essential to painting, be it the animal faith that the impressionist had in life or the concrete faith of the cubist in textures and lines. The Viennese haze that settles between the surrealist's eye and the world, by bringing its diversity to a shameful common denominator, disintegrates actual objects and people to such a degree that painting them becomes an artificial exercise. The saying of Poussin, "There is no painting without solid," refers both to objects and to our faith in them. The surrealist's postulate that he approaches the world with a blank mind, without the pre-ordered scaffolding that alone can hold it together, may mean an admirably impartial attitude for a scientist, but it may also mean death to that will to do without which no artist could ply his trade.

Even if the artist worships himself as a prophet or hero his approach to his material must remain that of an artisan. Most intellectual of them all, da Vinci, who did not relish this puttering with pots and pans, gave himself courage by writing that painting was a better craft than sculpture because one could indulge in it without removing one's lace cuffs or rolling up one's sleeves. Still, painting may prove too much of a manual trade to be indulged in by the surrealist if he truly wants to deal in the irrational. As soon as unreason is pitted against material laws there is breakage and hell to pay; a truly irrational archi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tect would see his building collapse as soon as it emerged above ground level. The knowledge of materials, pressure, resistance, elasticity, the dove-tailing of blocks or welding of metal cores are essential to the act of building. A man like Gaudi may achieve a make-believe surrealist house whose baroque curves remind one of lava flowing or muscles heaving, but the same reasonable knowledge must go into its planning, if it is to be a house at all, as into a Le Corbusier "machine for living." Sculpture and painting, inasmuch as they have a body, are, like the house, subject to natural laws and could not exist, whatever their apparent content, if they were not strictly within nature's reasonableness.

In the same way that a house, a sculpture, a painting submit to the laws of nature, the artist's body, itself one of his tools, functions on the reasonable plan of other animal bodies, even if the painter's tenets are the glorification of the irrational: "Who shall add one inch to his stature?" A lamb chop on the shoulder or the brassiere on a male chest[1] cannot deny the inner anatomical architecture which through the arm, wrist and fingers may communicate itself to the picture, pollute with its good health the psychopathic intentions of the author. A hand working freely, as in the case of Monet, gives to painting a healthy animal tang which would be rather at odds with the tenets of surrealism. Hence the search for safer means which will preserve a purer brand of unreason and in which the hand is no longer concerned: photo-montage, print-collages, rubbings, through which the thought or vision may somehow express itself without being straightened and strained through the sieve of organic experience. Thus Max Ernst enthrones himself amongst a hodge-podge of 19th-century wood engravings, daguerreotypes, and hardware with the same royal nonchalance as the hermit crab lodges in the shell of a deceased mollusk; and with pastepot and scissors injects unexpected meanings into those old things. The fear of autography grips even those surrealists who, somewhat suspicious of the ready-made, still produce their pictures

[1] Worn by Dali at a surrealist ball.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by hand. The extremely cautious brush stroke of a Dali is truly as inert as the cut-outs of an Ernst. The fragments from old masters, from snapshots, from anatomical plates that constitute his stock in trade recur time and again in his pictures, identical but in shuffled order, reminiscent of the franker methods of a montage. One step further towards impersonal handling and we have the modified objects—furred cups and similar freaks.

Yet even if you kill the hand unreason is not saved, for the skeptical could argue that our brain itself is as much a part of nature's scheme as our hand and that, prisoner as it is of the universal logic of creation, its efforts to escape are probably inadequate. A surrealist scene can be fabricated simply by inverting the relative proportions of normal objects and situations. Our grandfathers' favorite was the painting of a cardinal eating lobster at a lavishly garnished table. If we shrink the cardinal to a size where he would fit at ease on the plate and enlarge the lobster until it fills the prelate's armchair we have a typical paranoiac picture which satisfies the most exacting standards of the good taste of tomorrow. Just as a photographic negative, though it paints nature's white black can boast of little fantasy, and just as the devil may be said to ape God, the too logical unreason which happens to be reason reversed has little claim to be an irrational process.

It would seem that the perfectly unreasonable picture could be the work of a madman only, but few such genuine creations fit easily into the surrealist bracket. Madmen go wrong at one point in their reasoning but as soon as they have branched away from the main road they follow their erroneous path with tenacious logic. The surrealist unlogic occurs rather in those relaxed moods of dream and day-dream which are typical Freudian hunting grounds. The two operations conducive to such moods are, first, a conscious state in which a store of images accumulates in us, to be released in apparent disorder in the second, subconscious stage. Consider the two operations necessary to the functioning of a mechanical toy: the grim expression and muscular effort that attend the winding of the spring, reminiscent

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of our articulate activities, contrasted with the disorderly, noisy, comical animation that attends the uncoiling of the spring, and that is similar to our dream mood. Subconscious vision proceeds, like movie fade-outs and fade-ins, by swift, unrelated changes of scenery. Its objects have a lack of tactile reality. No medium is elastic enough to describe this dream world. Cinema can approach only its tempo; words are too rigid to fit shifting meanings. Painting, with its static monumentality, is perhaps with sculpture the least fitted of mediums to describe it accurately.

The man who embarks on a voyage into the Freudian realm with the too innocent faith that the new land, however fanciful its vistas, is the wholly natural phenomenon of a release from inhibitions, is bound soon to be disturbed by an imperceptible passage into the psychic. There the soothing voice of the psychoanalist gives way to the scratchings of automatic pencils in the dark, the fist of the expounding professor is replaced by the raps of turning tables, the text-book is superseded by visions and voices. Reason may be clumsy but it acts as a useful ballast for anchoring within the natural our humanity prone to flight. Having first divested himself of his armor of logic the surrealist comes nakedly face to face with the supernatural. To push forward with blank mind into the jungles of the irrational is to annul those centuries of bitter experience through which men at a dear cost sifted and labeled psychic phenomena, came to distinguish between what makes witches fly, were-wolves howl, John unroll his Apocalypse and Joan deliver France. Tradition, even if it be called old wives' gossip, would have been useful in charting the new country. Fra Angelico kneeled in joy when the angels held his brush but a surrealist will rejoice as much if some Ouija board entity dictates his picture. Unconcerned with the obvious implications of his own oath that he acts as medium, he views with satisfaction and profit the fruits of his labor, those representations of putrid matter, rancid bones, which to the uninitiated resemble a streamlining of the horns, tail and hooves of the devils of a less credulous age.

Schools of painting have always had their main reality on

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

paper. Painters have been bunched together according to their date of birth rather than an understanding of their *œuvre*. Thus the sculpturesque Renoir nestles with the impressionists, the Whistlerian Braque is labeled cubist. Surrealism is also the wish-fulfilment mirage of critics. If we look at personalities its entity weakens. Its most doubtful exponents are those older painters who were already committed to a personal style when surrealism was born. To eulogize their work ten years ago for lyrical or emotional reasons would have seemed misplaced and even libelous. They had led the cubist movement but cubism was fast becoming old-fashioned. The simplest way to keep them up to date was to change the label on their goods. Chirico's early work was hailed within the cubist movement for its building up of architectures with compass and ruler, its rigid perspective, its mathematical symbols, its house-painter's way of laying the paint flat. It is now lauded for its mysterious moods, sexual innuendos, disquieting titles. Picasso's work was more difficult to reinterpret because of its obvious plastic soundness, simplist subject-matter and good-humored craft. Some person, however, did a good job of it who, by changing the title of a cubist "Bather" to "Metamorphosis," chucked it full of menacing implications. Between this blatant misuse of cubism to make it appear what it is not and bona fide surrealism there is a twilight fringe of painters, lacking the constructive solidity of the one as well as the literary frills of the other. The gay Miro, Masson the sad, can be made to fit in either camp. The melancholy offerings of Tchelicheff and of Berman are too close to a Whistler Nocturne in mood and means to fit easily into the surrealist bracket. The more genuine surrealist picture should exhibit a cluster of haphazard objects realistically achieved. Though Pierre Roy is the pioneer of this comeback to a *trompe-l'oeil* his work is so bathed in French lucidity as to starve the amateur of unhealthy complexes. Dali alone, by telling strictly horror stories or worse, fulfils all the expectations of the surrealist fan.

Men who wish sausages get them hanging from their nose.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When Picasso some 15 years ago sighed that "Art is in need of David" he was voicing a desire for the reappearance of subject-matter, for a more objective rendition, for more craftsmanship in paint, conscious as he was of the defects of his own ego-swelled, sketch-mad era. No David but a Dali appeared in answer to this wish. Yet even though the new school features the sausage-shaped appendage reminiscent of the apologue instead of the Roman heroes dear to David, it brought back under this vile disguise some of the reforms that Picasso was asking for. The return to subject-matter and objective rendering is pregnant with consequences, reeducates the public into this only proper way for it to look at a picture. Compared to such a boon the kind of representation offered, offensive as it may be to some, is inconsequential. The artist ceases to be the egotist shut up in his tower. He must now come down from his pedestal into the street and gather a public to tell his story to. Surrealists reaffirm also the truth that art, whatever the manual labor involved, is preeminently a spiritual affair. They rescue from the too-physical armory of the cubist achievement this minute seed, this soul without which no picture of any school could live. That the artist needs a dæmon is of course no surrealist discovery, but the surrealists were brave enough to single out this fact from the discarded bric-à-brac of truths shelved by the cubists. The artist who yields to inspiration can no longer pretend that he is concerned only with himself and his own art problems. He becomes a channel for some agency more universal than himself. But though in the art-for-art achievement the artist could only hurt or ridicule himself, in art with universal implications his public too may be damaged. If his objectivity concerns only the social beliefs of a group the artist's only duty is to be accurate. But if he delves deeper into inspiration, or as we say now, follows the dictates of his subconscious, his manner approaches that of the prophet or the sibyl. For his own hygiene and that of his public he would do well in such case to be fastidious as to what gets hold of him.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the Workshop

Food and Society

War-Time Archives of the U. S. Food Administration

ALMON R. WRIGHT[1]

WITHIN the past two years a new institution, The National Archives, has appeared as an additional attraction for scholars who devote their hours for research to work in Washington. The first large collection of papers to be classified and thereby made readily usable in the new monumental building is that of the war-time Food Administration, directed by Herbert Hoover. To give the volume of the papers of that agency in terms of linear or cubic feet would mean little to most readers. But if the scholar of moderate means imagines that his attic contains not just a few stacks of dust-laden magazines but is filled to the rafters, that his entire second floor is packed from floor to ceiling, and that he is yielding his ground floor also to the mass of records he may get some idea of the amount of material available. A few of the records have been made illegible by water and others have been reduced to fragments by rats and mice. Most, however, are undamaged, even after seven years in the White House garage.

To win the war the government urged greater production and reduced consumption of foodstuffs. The Food Administration directed its campaign for conservation at the wholesaler, the retailer, and the consumer. Only a careful study of the collection would permit a conclusion as to which of the three was considered most important. For many of us, however, the war-time posters and placards, the badges and buttons distributed for the benefit of the public at large, remain a vivid memory. How frequently were depicted the fierce and cruel countenance of the Hun and the haggard face of the starving mother! To destroy the one and save the other, Americans were taught that "Food Will Win the War."

[1] A copy of the classification plan is made available to the scholar who visits The National Archives. He should also consult the card catalog. Those who are unable to use the records directly should address their requests to the Division of Reference, The National Archives, Washington, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The most significant measure for increasing the food supply was the stimulation of wheat production through the guarantee of a good price. The long-time effect of the war measures in encouraging a production which in times of peace became overproduction needs further research and reflection. It is a paradoxical fact that now and for years to come the taxpayer is and will be paying for increasing the crop acreage in 1918 and for plowing it under in 1934. The campaign to produce more food was carried not only to the farmer but to the patriots of the nation's "main street." The latter expressed their war-like fervor by transforming the greensward along that street into potato patches. In the papers of this collection the clever author may find rich sources of information for a portrayal of the social changes in America's village life.

The vast propaganda of the Food Administration was designed to affect all classes of people but upon women lay the real responsibility for conservation in the home. Theirs was the task of persuading the family that oleomargarine tasted just like butter or that coffee was better without sugar. Not restricting their activities to the home they volunteered to lecture, and before the days of the ubiquitous radio they made their voices heard around the whole country. Among the files of correspondence concerning the many women whose aid was very effective appear such names as Alice P. Norton, Ida M. Tarbell, and Gertrude B. Lane. After the conclusion of the struggle women won the long-coveted goal, the right to vote. The papers of the Food Administration offer valuable data on the development of the movement which culminated in the Nineteenth Amendment.

A moment's glance at *Who's Who in America* will confirm the belief that ours is a nation of joiners. The government took advantage of that fondness for social, fraternal and religious organizations which satisfies the American's love of any distinction which raises him, be it ever so slightly, above his fellows. What hours of labor went into the compilation by the Food Administration of those extensive lists of organizations for men, for women, for Protestants, for Catholics, for Jews, for white men and for colored men! Would it be possible to describe the social proclivities of Americans of the war period without making use of these files? The technique of employing these organizations to stimulate and maintain the ambition to "do our bit" at home is revealed in the correspondence.

The extent to which that spirit was aroused may be estimated by studying this collection. From the written opinions of the people, the scholar may judge whether traces of sectionalism appeared, whether New England was less enthusias-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tic than the Pacific Coast or whether the food conservation campaign was more successful in Indiana than in North Carolina. He may determine whether there were relatively more enforcement cases in Illinois than in Texas.

An examination of the correspondence files is interesting from another point of view. The Food Administration touched a multitude and required tens of thousands of persons to report the nature and extent of their business. More fearful than the surveillance implied was the duty of writing a letter. What confusion and utter bewilderment appear in the messages, from those written by a proprietor of a cotton-seed crushing mill to those by the manager of a local farm cooperative company! One finds sincerity, pathos and an astonishing degree of illiteracy even from the village postmaster. A careful study of these letters would reveal far more than statistics on the number of schools, students or teachers.

National prohibition was first a food conservation measure of an emergency character. The files of correspondence concerning brewers, therefore, are significant in tracing the development of temperance and abstinence. Here the labor leader, the minister, the brewer and the college president are found closely associated by a common interest. The Food Administration required the beverage manufacturers to make periodic reports. One wonders if those tabulators inspected somewhat longer or scanned a report more suspiciously if a German name appeared. Could a brewery under an old Teutonic name brew something else than alcoholic beverages?

The Food Administration papers offer considerable information on the foreign relations of the United States in the war period. To them the historian or political scientist should go to discover the relations between the British Ministry of Food and our own Food Administration. The weakening economic resources of England, France and Italy were, of course, studied by the experts of the Food Administration. The data they collected threw considerable light on how alarming the situation was.

The United States was a very good neighbor to the Latin states to the south of us during the war. Cubans, and American capitalists as well, watched with joy the price of sugar rise sevenfold and the sugar trade grow to the extent of making Cuba the possessor, for a few weeks, of the largest per-capita trade in the world. The economist or historian would be amply repaid if in his researches on that wild "dance of the millions" he turns to the extensive files on sugar in the Food Administration collection. These papers contain data on the war-time trade with Mexico in sisal and jute, essential to our shipment of grain to Eu-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rope. Perhaps the profits from this commerce dampened the sympathy of certain Mexicans toward the cause represented by the famous "Zimmerman Plot." Our economic relations with Brazil for many years have been concerned in great part with coffee. To the Food Administration collection one would turn for considerable material on the disposal of Brazil's surplus during the war time.

The inventive genius of the modern world has disadvantages as well as benefits. The various kinds of machines which duplicate the typed page have increased enormously the volume of records produced by government agencies. In this situation it is not familiarity but quantity which breeds contempt. Moreover even the trained scholar may refuse to project himself forward 100 years in order better to evaluate the war-time collections. For those who realize the worth of these government records the vast amount of material at hand is discouraging. Therefore it is the purpose of the National Archives to afford to the researcher as much guidance as possible to the richest of those sources in which he is interested.

Royal Road to Learning Chinese

INTENSIVE courses in the study of the Chinese Language will be offered this year by the American Council, Institute of Pacific Relations, from June 27 to August 20 at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Instruction will be under the direction of Dr. George A. Kennedy of Yale University.

The introductory course, designed to give an elementary reading knowledge of modern Chinese in 8 weeks, proved highly successful during its initial session in 1937. A full report appears in *Notes on Far Eastern Studies* No. 2, now in press.[1] This year, in addition to the introductory course for beginners, a second-year course for advanced students is being offered, comprising Newspaper Chinese, Stories from Chinese History, and Selections from Well-known Chinese Novels. The project has been planned primarily for the benefit of graduate students and others professionally interested in Far-Eastern activities who lack time for a full year's study of the language. The class in 1937 included people brought to it by academic, business, art and editorial interests.

A limited number of tuition scholarships and grants-in-aid are available for those desiring to enrol for this summer session. Applications should be addressed to Jean W. Kennedy, 80 Howe Street, New Haven, Connecticut, not later than May 1st.

[1] Published by the American Council of Learned Societies, 907 Fifteenth Street, Washington, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Division of Music, the Library of Congress

CEDRIC LARSON

ONE of the largest collections of music, including musical compositions and literature about music, in the world is housed in the Library of Congress at Washington, in its Division of Music.

As of June 30, 1936, the last year for which figures are available, there were 1,048,877 volumes and pieces of music in the archives of this Division. The number of such musical accessions varies markedly from year to year but runs to between 15,000 and 20,000 on the average.

In the collection of musical literature there were on June 30, 1936 more than 64,000 volumes and shorter pieces of work covering such items as biographies of composers, musical history, bound volumes of musical magazines and periodicals. (Bound volumes of the major musical periodicals are available in the Library.) In addition to these 64,000 items the Library included, as of the same date, 37,000 volumes or items classified under musical theory—material devoted to instruction, methods and so on.

The great collection of the Division of Music is constantly augmented in three ways: by copyright, gift and purchase, by far the largest number of items coming in by copyright.

This library is rich in Americana and owns collections that cannot be duplicated. One such group is the Victor Herbert Deposit, which consists of a substantial share of Mr. Herbert's musical estate. This unique collection includes the full scores, holograph, of a great part of the operettas which comprise the composer's best-known works—*Cyrano de Bergerac, Babette, The Red Mill, The Prima Donna, Old Dutch, Naughty Marietta, When Sweet Sixteen, The Enchantress, Mlle. Rosita, The Only Girl, Princess Pat, Eileen, My Golden Girl, The Girl in the Spotlight* and *Oui, Madame.* The Joseph Muller Collection consists of first and early editions of the Star-Spangled Banner—about 68 in all—brought out in the years 1814-1864. Or, in lighter vein, no better sources for a study of presidential campaign songs could be found than those housed in this Library.

The Archives of American Folk Song are singularly interesting. The honorary curator of the Archive, Mr. John A. Lomax, has traveled extensively throughout the United States, recording on disk records the indigenous folk songs he has found, particularly from isolated and rural areas. This remarkable collection consists of nearly 1000 records of close to 3,000 tunes and songs gathered from virtually every section of America. There are songs and ballads of English or-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

igin, White spirituals, cowboy songs, sea chanties, Creole and Mexican songs and a rich and wide variety of Negro songs from the South and some of the West Indies. In penitentiaries Mr. Lomax finds a wide cross section of the black population and from these convicts not only learns many folk songs but gets clues which lead him to some isolated "musical pocket" in a little-known region, more or less untouched by civilization, where the primitive folk song persists today much in the same form that it did a century or two ago.

The Division of Music houses an outstanding collection of musical incunabula. In this rare field there are madrigals from England and Italy, tablatures, early treatises on musical theory, autograph letters of masters, the first editions of famous musicians.

One of the really great fields of the Division, without rival anywhere in scope, breadth and number, is its collection of opera libretti and opera scores. The Library's collection of Rossini's compositions is a typical example of the case in point. Of his 38 operas the Library of Congress has the full orchestral scores of 32, in 39 different copies, in addition to the vocal scores of 36 of the 38 operas in some 80 editions.

The Division owns specimen scores in the handwriting of virtually every first-rank composer and remarkably complete collections in the cases of many. Such present-day composers as Stravinsky, Schönberg, Bloch, Malipiero, Prokofieff, Bartók and many others are well represented, moreover, in holographs, autograph letters and similar memorabilia. Often when a musical collection comes onto the market the Library buys it *en bloc* and adds it to its archives—one such acquisition, made in 1934-35, being the Rafael Joseffy collection of 21 manuscripts of Franz Liszt.

Very often the Library builds up its collection of the work of some one composer who, although of minor contemporary reputation, achieves more substantial fame with the passing of the years. A case in point is Gaetano Brunetti (d. 1808) of whose musical works the Division owns about a dozen autograph symphonies, 6 overtures and 36 quintets in addition to many sonatas, minuets and country dances—all holographs. In such collections lies the real opportunity for the musicologist. Brunetti's work has remained largely unpublished and unstudied and in gathering this virgin material the Library has made investigation and publication possible.

Any research worker desiring more specific information is welcome to write a letter of inquiry to the Chief of the Division of Music or to call in person and consult the elaborate card index maintained by the Division.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Discussion

The Conference Cure for Ignorance of Hispanic America

To the Editor:

I write to congratulate you upon the publication in the Autumn number of the *American Scholar* of Dr. James A. Robertson's "Cure Our Ignorance of Hispanic America." Dr. Robertson gives a fair picture of the opportunities for the study of Hispanic American problems in the United States, and because of my long-standing interest in these questions I am glad the *American Scholar* gave space to his discussion. I believe it my duty, however, to correct a misapprehension which may arise from Dr. Robertson's remarks about the Inter-American Center at The George Washington University. These were as follows:

> George Washington offers special courses in history and literature throughout the year and for several years, because of its Center of Hispanic American Studies and its summer seminar, promised to become one of the greatest centers; but for the moment the latter peculiar and excellent feature seems unfortunately to have been changed in direction.

It is true that the summer seminar-conference on Hispanic America formerly given at the University has been dropped after a number of years of experience. With a steady decline in enrolments the University authorities were reluctantly brought to the conclusion that conference activity here ought to be confined to the regular terms. That this is not unusual seems to be borne out by a note received from the Dean of our Summer Sessions, Dr. Robert W. Bolwell, who writes:

> In the annual meetings of the National Association of Summer Sessions Deans and Directors, various experiments in special institutes, conferences, round tables, panel groups, and the like, on a wide variety of subjects are discussed. It seems that these special conferences vary in success and interest at different times and places. At no meeting, however, has it been the consensus of those who administer summer sessions work that this type of educational procedure worked better in the summer than in the regular academic semesters or terms. In many instances special conferences have been more successful when held in the fall or spring terms, at which time a larger number of university students and teachers are on hand to share in the meetings and discussions. Many conferences which are held in the summer sessions are subsidized by foundations or

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

corporations, thereby relieving the institution holding the conference of much of the expense.

It was because of this background that the "peculiar feature" to which Dr. Robertson refers has been "changed in direction"; whether "unfortunately" or not is a matter of opinion concerning which only the future can decide. The important point, however, and the matter about which I desire to forestall possible misconceptions, is that the Inter-American Center of The George Washington University has by no means abandoned the conference idea but rather has entered upon a much broader program of conferences and at a more seaonable period of the year. On December 6, 7 and 8, 1937 a very successful series of conferences and discussions was held under the chairmanship of George Howland Cox, Director of the Center, on the general topic "Pan Americanism—Its Justification and Future," with separate sections dealing with Culture and Education (*Chairman*, Charles Gilmore Maphis, Director of the Institute of Public Affairs, University of Virginia); Law and Political Relations (*Chairman*, Raymond Leslie Buell, President of the Foreign Policy Association); News and Communications (*Chairman*, John L. Merrill, President of the Pan American Society); and Commerce and Finance (*Chairman*, James S. Carson, Chairman of the United States Committee of the Inter-American Commercial Arbitration Committee). The comprehensiveness of the program is indicated by the list of speakers which included the Honorable Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State of the United States; Señor Don Manuel de Freyre y Santander, Ambassador from Peru; Señor Dr. Don Adriàn Recinos, Minister from Guatemala; Dr. Leo S. Rowe, Director General of the Pan American Union; Señor Dr. Don Héctor David Castro, Minister from El Salvador; Dr. Ricardo J. Alfaro, former President of the Republic of Panama; Judge Otto Schoenrich, a former member of the Puerto Rican Commission on Revision of Laws; Mr. Evan E. Young, Vice President of Pan American Airways; William Van Bergen Van Dyck, Vice President of the International General Electric; Harry L. Harris, Advertising Manager of the United Fruit Company; and the author.

The University is particularly indebted to the specialists in various fields who participated in the panel discussions which followed the prepared addresses. These panel-members included Mr. Harry Frantz, United Press; Mrs. Irma Goebel Labastille, Lecturer on Latin American Music; Dr. W. R. Manning, Department of State; Dr. John T. Vance, Library of Congress; Professor Mary W. Williams, Goucher College; Mr. E. W. James, United States Bureau of Public Roads; Mr. W. A. Wieland, Associated Press; Professor Edward Cam-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pion Acheson, Professorial Lecturer in Economics, The George Washington University; Professor James C. Corliss, Associate Professor of Inter-American Economics, The George Washington University; Dr. Roy T. Davis, Former Minister to Panama; Mr. William A. Reid, former Foreign Trade Adviser, Pan American Union; and Mr. Silvino da Silva, Foreign Trade Adviser, Pan American Union.

It is significant that the audiences throughout the conferences were large, attentive and appreciative. Some 1600 persons applied for tickets to one or more of the sessions and more than 1000 were present at the opening session on December 6th. Of equal significance is the fact that the Honorable Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, chose the opening session of the conferences as the appropriate occasion to make a very important pronouncement on the responsibilities of Americans residing or doing business in Latin American countries in the matter of their amenability to the laws of the respective countries. This address and those of the other distinguished speakers on the program were broadcast not only in English over a nation-wide hook-up but by short-wave radio in Spanish and Portugese to Latin America immediately on delivery. Subsequently they were rebroadcast by short-wave radio to Europe.

Speaking only for myself, but on the basis of long contact with related fields, I do not believe that the change in direction referred to has been "unfortunate." In fact I am certain that the emphasis now placed upon vital contemporary problems of social and economic significance in a number of areas of human activity, as contrasted with more restricted and somewhat more academic fields (such for instance as the colonial history of Latin America—historically important and erudite though such studies may be), together with the more favorable time of year at which the conferences are hereafter to be held will fully justify the University's carefully considered decision to make the changes necessitated by this broader program.

HENRY GRATTAN DOYLE

TWO IMPORTANT NEW BOOKS

The Living Torch

By "A E"

Comprising various material which has not hitherto appeared in book-form. Edited and with eighty-page introductory essay by Monk Gibbon. $4.00

A Vision

By W. B. YEATS

Setting forth the esoteric principles, doctrines and experiences from which much of his work derives its inspiration. $3.00

at all bookstores

THE MACMILLAN CO.
60 Fifth Ave., New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

About Our Authors

Quotation marks usually indicate passages taken directly from autobiographical letters requested from the authors themselves.

After JOHN H. RANDALL, JR., professor of philosophy at Columbia and an editor of THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR, had read Datus Smith's "A Plea for Unprincipled Education" (Autumn 1937 AMERICAN SCHOLAR) in ms. he wrote: "I am heartily in favor of everybody being as unprincipled as possible. In fact, I have just delivered an address on the importance of being unprincipled in politics which I will send you with the slightest encouragement." . . . Later, when the promise had been literally interpreted, Professor Randall sent in his article with the following letter: "I observe that you yourself are so lacking in principle as to have set down the bald lie that I have 'definitely promised' you an article on being unprincipled in political action. This piece of dirty politics on your part certainly deserves every encouragement and I am therefore sending you the article. . . . The conclusions embodied in this paper are the results of long experience and observation and study and reflection, which have forced me from an original addiction to the drug of principle to my present wisdom; and I am prepared to support them by a metaphysics, a logic, a theory of knowledge and an axiology, all of which are so authoritative as to be positively stupefying. I am, in other words, prepared to fight to the death in defense of my philosophic principles; but I am quite willing to come to any kind of low-down compromise so far as editorial action is concerned."

Whenever "the morbid desire to think" takes hold of JOHN HODGDON BRADLEY he runs away. "I know it is heresy to say so, but I have not found a university environment notably conducive to thought. I am a runaway at present. Some time ago it occurred to me that after having taught the facts of geologic history for a decade I might profitably try to discover the meaning of those facts. After more than a year I am still trying. At any rate my larynx is getting a rest and my brain a workout, and neither has destroyed me yet. Though I honestly enjoy teaching I must include among my particular dislikes the attempt to teach and think simultaneously." . . . His early career was somewhat like that of a rolling stone and included positions at Harvard, the Universities of North Carolina and Montana and, finally, the University of Southern California where he has been professor of geology since 1929. . . . He has written four or five books, this "escapist" literature including *The Earth and Its History, Parade of the Living, Autobiography of Earth, Farewell Thou Busy World* and numerous contributions to journals both lay and technical.

KENNETH M. GOULD needs no recommendation other than his contributions to former numbers—"Social Forces in Revolution" (Winter 1935) and "Legislating Loyalty" (Summer 1935). . . . "All my adult life I've been fussing with print and paper, and I think the editorial profession as grand an opportunity for creative expression as any. The periodical press is a very much underrated instrument of adult education. I've always been associated with education in the broad sense—I've done editorial work for the *Journal of Social Hygiene*, Rockefeller Foundation and the *American Journal of Public Health*. For the last 11 years I've been managing editor of *Scholastic*, the high school classroom weekly, which seeks to inject a little leaven into the lump of American secondary education. A deadline every Friday for a 48-page magazine carries one blessing—it allows no time to mope." . . . His leisure he fills with things he likes and would like more of—tennis, chess, friends, conversation, travel. He is wise, since "Breath's a ware that will not keep."

Out of his own rich knowledge of Italian literature ERNEST H. WILKINS, President of Oberlin College since 1927, greets the David who holds the chair of Italian Literature he himself once occupied at the University of Chicago. For years President Wilkins taught in the Romance language field, first at Amherst, then at Harvard, and later at the University of Chicago (where he was also Dean of the Colleges of Arts, Literature and Science). His published work includes scholarly books from his own field (*Dante—Poet and Apostle* and *The Trees of the Genealogia deorum*) and books of greater popular interest (*The Changing College, The College and Society* and *A Platform for Life*). . . . It is entirely appropriate that this review should come from the pen of a man keenly interested not only in Italian literature but in the problem of peace and war.

W. F. ALBRIGHT looks for warm controversy following the publication of "Archeology Confronts Biblical Criticism," which the editors had originally named "Archeology Confronts Modernism" but changed because the author is too much of a modernist to sing from another pew. He represents a felicitous combination of an ancient world checking up on its reconstruction by

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

● Not Good Theater . . .

It is easy—all too easy—to fall into the habit of dramatizing, in one's own mind, foreign news, and of identifying governments and men with the traditional stock characters of the drama.

And so we have, in this country, large groups of people who see one nation and its leaders as villains, exerting a force wholly evil, and another nation as heroic, and though sore beset, sure to triumph in the end.

In fact, however, there is no end. The processes of government stubbornly refuse to adapt themselves to stage moralities.

And, if examined by the cold light of reason, the swashbuckling dictators and militarists as well as the rabble-rousing followers of the red flag become once again just people, each attempting with the same sincerity and the same honesty to guide their respective nations along the paths which to them seem best.

When these paths conflict, and war results, it is the better course for individuals and for governments to attempt to find and eliminate the basic causes, rather than to give way to the unreasoning blindness of partisanship. Successful avoidance of war by a nation necessitates, on the part of the government and the electorate, a thorough understanding of the aims and methods of its neighbor nations.

For almost one hundred years it has been the function of THE LIVING AGE to bring to America complete, accurate and unbiased accounts of major foreign happenings, "written by the men who were there."

To the man or woman to whom this type of reporting appeals—may we suggest that you become acquainted with THE LIVING AGE through the medium of our special, money-saving introductory offer? Send two dollars, together with your name and address for a six months trial subscription, today.

● **THE LIVING AGE**
63 Park Row
New York City

When writing to advertisers please mention THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

modern theologians. "I don't like to show off but it may be advisable to give a few facts to reassure earnest readers who may be a little suspicious of my competence." The author is W. W. Spence Professor of Semitic Languages at the John Hopkins University. For 12 years he directed the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem, and during and after this period carried out numerous campaigns of excavation and exploration. He is vice-president of the Society of Biblical Literature and of the American Schools of Oriental Research, past president of the American Oriental Society and the Palestine Oriental Society; and in 1936 received three honorary doctorates—from the University of Utrecht, the Jewish Theological Seminary of America and the Jewish Institute of Religion.

GARDNER MURPHY, who has been a member of the department of psychology at Columbia since the World War, became interested in telepathy while a junior at Yale and "majored" in psychology largely because he had been impressed by the English and French research on that problem. In 1917 he worked with Dr. L. T. Troland at Harvard on the problem of telepathy and from 1919 to 1925, while an instructor at Columbia, he gave a large part of his time, both reading and experimenting, to the problem of ESP. He has watched Dr. Rhine's experiments as the climax to prior but sporadic work on ESP and has himself helped to take scientific work on telepathy and clairvoyance out of its sere and yellow leaf of neglect. . . . "So far as psychology is concerned my chief interests are social psychology, abnormal psychology and the psychology of personality and my chief writing has been in the field of social psychology. . . . I particularly resent all that modern fogginess which consists of spelling science with a capital S, implying that we have suddenly discovered one perfect and complete, specially prepared, highway to (capitalized) Truth, as one fixed, eternal, indivisible reality, savior of man. . . . I have an experimental philosophy; I don't think we know much about the universe; and I believe in courting ridicule rather than being a stuffed shirt."

E. V. HUNTINGTON, professor of mechanics at Harvard University, has been teaching mathematics there since 1901. He writes: "In attempting to respond to your request for some sort of apologia pro vita mea (which I take to be a polite euphemism for some sort of blurb to entice unwary readers) I find it extremely difficult to write out anything that does not sound like an obituary notice. Mathematics is the most romantic and

Outstanding Publications on The American College

The Colleges and Public Life—The Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth Annual Meeting, 1938. Addresses by Harold L. Ickes, Heinrich Bruening, Robert M. Hutchins, A. J. Carlson, Norman Foerster, and T. V. Smith. Descriptions of College Courses in Public Affairs. Annual Reports, Minutes, Membership, Constitution. (BULLETIN, March 1938.) $1.50.

BULLETIN of the Association of American Colleges, edited by Guy E. Snavely. Issued four times a year. $3.00.

Comprehensive Examinations in American Colleges by Edward Safford Jones. Report of an investigation. $2.50.

Comprehensive Examinations in the Humanities by Edward Safford Jones. Questions used in senior terminal examinations. Single copy, $1.25; 10 copies, $10.00.

College Music by Randall Thompson. Report of an investigation of non-professional offerings in selected typical institutions. The Macmillan Company, New York. $2.50.

Architectural Planning of the American College by J. Fredrick Larson and Archie M. Palmer. The McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York. $2.00.

A Survey of College Faculties by B. W. Kunkel. Report of an investigation of the background of college teachers. Single copy, 25 cents; 10 copies, $2.00.

The College Library by Henry M. Wriston. Single copy, 10 cents; 12 copies, $1.00; 100 copies, $6.00.

Orders for the above publications may be sent to the

Association of American Colleges
19 West 44th Street New York, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The FRATERNITY MAN or WOMAN

IS DISTINGUISHED BY EVIDENCE OF GOOD BREEDING AND DISCRIMINATION « « « GIFTS, FAVORS AND PERSONAL ACCESSORIES REFLECT IMPECCABLE GOOD TASTE « « « THIS IS ONLY ONE OF THE MANY REASONS FRATERNITY MEN AND WOMEN SELECT THE L. G. BALFOUR COMPANY AS THEIR OFFICIAL JEWELER

BALFOUR

MANUFACTURERS OF

Insignia
Pledge — Badges — Keys — Special Pins

Paper Products
Stationery — Invitations — Programs

Awards
Cups — Medals — Trophies — Plaques

Favors
A wide selection to fit any occasion.

Gifts
Hollow Ware — Novelties — Rings — Cases — Bracelets

Leather
Bill Folds — Key Cases — Bags and Leather Novelties

★ ★

SOLE OFFICIAL JEWELER TO Phi Beta Kappa

THE L. G. BALFOUR COMPANY

ATTLEBORO MASSACHUSETTS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

imaginative of all the sciences, but it would take a real poet to bring out its human side. Since I am not even a blank-verse poet I can only echo what was well said in a recent number—if what an author has to say has any merit, it does not matter who it is that says it." . . . To add qualification to merit, however, it should be pointed out that the author has followed the Duke experiments closely from their inception, is a past vice-president of the American Mathematical Society and a past president of the Mathematical Association of America, has recently been elected a Fellow of the Institute of Mathematical Statistics, and is the author of a number of technical books and articles in the field of mathematics.

HAROLD SPROUT'S discussion of the division of the treaty-making powers in this country in terms of its furor or efficiency grows out of a long-standing interest in "the techniques of the individuals and pressure groups who have shaped, and are today shaping, the foreign policies of the United States," an interest supplemented by careful study of the relative merits of empowering the Senate or the President to act as our agent for collective bargaining between nations. He himself does not take sides. His study may have taught him diplomacy; or his experience as a member of the staff at various universities (Wisconsin, Miami, Stanford and now Princeton) may have taught him academic disinterestedness. He passed his childhood and early youth in a remote corner of the Middle West, graduated from Oberlin and took his Ph.D. in law and political science at Wisconsin—thus giving the lie to those who believe a Middle Westerner incapable of interest in any but domestic affairs.

When NICHOLAS BERDYAEV, "remarkable modern voice speaking from the Christian soul of ancient Russia," was 25 he was exiled for three years to the North and was thereafter under constant threat of arrest. During the Revolution he fought the materialistic and atheistic spirit of communism. In 1920 he was elected professor of philosophy at the Moscow University and in the same year was arrested by the Tcheka but was soon released. In 1922, however, he was again arrested and together with a group of other writers and scientists was exiled from Russia, on purely ideological and not political grounds. From 1922 to 1924 he lived in Berlin and there founded a "Religious-Philosophical Academy," which brought together all the outstanding Christian intellectual Russian leaders abroad. In 1924 he moved to Paris, where the Academy had been transferred. . . . He is an active participant in a vast number of international Christian conferences yet has found time to write *The Meaning of History, Freedom and the Spirit, The Destiny of Man* and *The Origin of Russian Communism.* The constancy of his belief in the value of man has been as undeviating as his alignment with the forces of "liberty and justice and mercy."

JEAN CHARLOT'S "Deposition from the Cross," as developed in three media (oil painting, woodcut and lithograph) was reproduced in the Spring 1937 AMERICAN SCHOLAR, in conjunction with his article, "Painter's Insight, Public's Sight." He needs no further credentials. . . . A Frenchman by birth, he is usually linked with the so-called Mexican Renascence movement. . . . "I frescoed walls in the University of Mexico and the Ministry of Public Education from 1922 to 1925 and was so taken by Mexican subject matter that it still constitutes a heavy percentage of my pictures. Though the lack of walls has made it impossible for me for ten years to pursue my vocation of mural painting I still have an uneasy feeling that painting easel pictures is somewhat akin to embroidering doilies. I am much interested now in lithography, and have patented, with Albert Carman, a process for color lithography. As to artistic creeds I believe that they should be seen but not heard—that is, that a picture should carry its meaning to the layman directly through subject matter." . . . In giving permission for the reproduction of a detail from Dali's "Illuminated Pleasures," part of the Sidney Janis Collection, Mr. Janis said: "You don't have to tell me who you are. If Charlot is writing for your pages I don't need to know anything else."

For over two years ALMON R. WRIGHT has been classifying the enormous bulk of government documents. . . . "As a by-product of this work I have gained a rather cordial dislike for typewriters, mimeograph machines and all other duplicating devices which complicate and magnify the task. Even such words as 'in quintuplicate' have an ominous sound. For diversion I turn to research and writing in Argentine history."

CEDRIC LARSON, who works in the Division of Accessions, the Library of Congress, has had material published in *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, *American Speech* and other periodicals.

HENRY GRATTAN DOYLE has been dean of Columbian College, George Washington University, since 1934. His work as associate editor of *Hispania* and as a member of the Council on Hispano-American Studies speaks for his profound interest in Latin America.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IN addition to the capable production of novels and other literary works in large editions for publishers; we are prepared to design and execute in an individual manner: Genealogies, Catalogues of Collections, and other privately printed Books.

The Haddon Craftsmen
Camden, New Jersey

New York Office: 393 Seventh Avenue

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Vital and Scholarly Magazine

THE WORLD OBSERVER

Special Monthly Articles on Education, the Arts, Philosophy, Psychology.

This stimulating magazine graphically reveals how various peoples of every section of the world feel, think and act. Articles of profound significance on international and cultural subjects are written especially for THE WORLD OBSERVER by famous writers of authoritative standing. You will discover through its pages each month what is being done to promote good will and cooperation among all nations.

Some of the Writers Contributing to THE WORLD OBSERVER:

James Hilton
H. G. Wells
George Lansbury
E. Graham Howe
Shaw Desmond
Princess Brinda of Kapurthala
Salvador de Madariaga
Waldemar Kaempffert
President Edouard Benes
Paul Kaufman
Katherine Glover
Hornell Hart
Gault MacGowan

SPECIAL SUBSCRIPTION OFFER
TO ALL LIBRARIES
3 Years For $4.00

Because of its live, informative and comprehensive reading matter, THE WORLD OBSERVER is a valuable addition to any library.

THE WORLD OBSERVER
11 West 42nd Street, New York City, U. S. A.

Please enter my subscription for.....year(s) for the World Observer. I enclose $2.00 for one year (12 issues), $2.50 outside U. S.

Name.....

Address.....

.....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED